

THE
REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW

No. 3.—JULY—1907.

I.

A WAVERING WITNESS.*

BY THE REV. WASHINGTON GLADDEN,
COLUMBUS, OHIO.

Sirs, what must I do to be saved? And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved. Acts 16: 30, 31.

One sometimes wonders whether the answer of the prisoners really met the question in the mind of the jailer; whether the kind of salvation of which he was thinking was not a little different from that to which they pointed him? It is evident, however, that they succeeded in getting him to think of what was in their minds, and to see and feel his need of deliverance, not merely from the severities of the Roman law, which might hold him responsible for the loosening of the shackles of his prisoners, but from a worse condemnation for neglect and disobedience to a higher law.

Without, however, trying to investigate the psychological processes in the mind of this Philippian jailer, I wish to take his question, and the answer of Paul and Silas, as a convenient statement of what is generally considered to be an evangelical experience. This question and this answer have, I dare say,

* The anniversary sermon in the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in the United States at Lancaster, Pa., May 7, 1907.

been used more frequently than any other sentences in the New Testament as expressing what is central and essential in the gospel of Jesus Christ.

"What must I do to be saved?" The question is supposed to be one which all human beings, aware of their true moral condition, have need to ask.

It implies that there are certain serious and perhaps fatal consequences of our own misdoing or neglect from which we cannot escape without help from some higher Power. It implies the need of the intervention of an agency above ourselves to rescue us from the evil which we are bringing upon ourselves.

The question is not, "What shall I do to save myself?" it is "What shall I do to *be* saved?" There is something that I cannot do, that must be done for me. Nevertheless there is something that will not be done for me, and that I must do for myself. The question is not: "What is going to be done to save me?" It is "What must *I* do to *be* saved?"

The divine intervention is necessary, but the human initiative in laying hold of the divine help and appropriating it is also necessary.

The first thing to do, therefore, in the work of evangelism, is to awaken the sense of moral need which shall result in arousing men to ask this question, "What shall I do to be saved?" Conviction of sin is an old-fashioned phrase which represents a fact of experience by no means out of date.

We are sometimes told, however, that this fact of experience is becoming infrequent, almost obsolete. "There is not nearly so much conviction of sin in these days as there used to be," the old preachers tell us. "And there seems to be much less emphasis placed on this feature of the evangelical experience than once there was. The ministers do not put much stress upon it, and if they do it is resented by their hearers. People do not want to hear talk of this kind, and the pulpit is forced to take a compromising attitude."

If these things are so, there is need of some serious thinking. The fact of sin has not disappeared from human nature, and if the sense of sin is less vivid, there is some loss of reality in our apprehension of things. The fact of moral unworthiness is not a pleasant fact to think of, but wise men do not ignore facts because they are unpleasant. Nor has it been always true hitherto that human beings have refused to face this fact of sin when it has been fearlessly and faithfully presented to them by men whose sincerity they did not distrust. John the Baptist did not flinch from telling the Judeans the naked truth, and he had the whole population for his audience. Savonarola denounced the follies and vices of the Florentines with unsparing severity, bating not his maledictions before the throne, and they thronged the Duomo, day after day, and listened with strong crying and tears, to his fiery words. John Knox was not the utterer of smooth sayings, but when he spoke Scotland listened, in palace and in cottage. That men do often refuse to hear the truth, I know; sometimes partizanship shuts their minds; sometimes inveterate prejudices render them incapable of recognizing the simplest facts. But where there are no idols of the tribe to defend, and the question is one that appeals to universal experience, men have generally been willing to listen to those who told them plain and wholesome truth, if that truth was presented in just proportion.

What is the reason, then, why the church of to-day finds it so difficult to make men face this fact of moral unworthiness and spiritual need? The people of New York and Philadelphia and Chicago and Columbus, may not have just the same kind of sins to repent of that were charged against the people of Jerusalem or Florence or Edinburgh, but they have sins enough of their own; and the need of a stern self-judgment and a profound humiliation is as deep and real in these modern populations as it ever was in those ancient ones. The crimes of those elder days were coarser and more bestial, but their ideals were low and crude; from our higher and finer standards

our lapse is no less culpable. Why is it that we do not feel it? Why do our prophets fail to bring us to our knees in penitence? We are admonished that the ancient sacrifice of a humble and a contrite heart still stands, but we are also warned to beware lest we forget it, and that warning is not superfluous. We have forgotten it, and our moral teachers seem to have poor success in recalling it to our attention.

Here is a social fact of great seriousness. It indicates that the entire apparatus of evangelism is out of gear. What is the matter?

One answer, which is apt to be promptly made, is that the failure we are considering is the fault of the new theology. That is a conveniently indefinite phrase: what is the new theology? Many of us are constrained to admit that our theology is new, in some of its essential parts, at any rate. A theology which has nothing new in it is like a tree with no new buds or leaves; it is not alive. "Every scribe that is instructed into the Kingdom of Heaven is like unto a man that is a householder, who bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old." He who saith, "Behold I make all things new," may be supposed to be at work in our theology as well as in our biology.

But I confess that there are elements in what is sometimes regarded as new theology which do tend to blur the sense of moral responsibility and thus to minimize the fact of sin. I am not at all sure that these elements are all new; I seem to find traces of them in many old philosophizings. Augustine himself suggests this confusion, and many of the schoolmen fall into it bodily.

The tendency to which I refer is that exaggerated monism, which practically amounts to Pantheism; which identifies God with nature, and makes every natural operation essentially divine. Such a philosophy may try to find room for sin, but its implications reduce moral unworthiness to its lowest terms. In following its worst inclinations the soul would seem, by

this theory, to be under a divine impulse. The worst that you can say about it is that it is seeking the good in a mistaken way.

Of this philosophy the recent utterances of Mr. Campbell, of London, give an explicit statement. I have read carefully what Mr. Campbell has to say about this, for with much of his contention I find myself in deep sympathy; but in this matter I cannot follow his argument. "The soul and the source of all things" he argues, "is God; and consciously or unconsciously all men are seeking God, in that they are seeking self-expression, seeking life. . . . And when the tendency goes round and works havoc and ruin in the world it still remains a quest for God, although a blundering one. It is a misuse of divine energy. The man who got drunk last night and gratified his lower nature in that delirious hour, would be surprised if you were to tell him when you see the result that he was really seeking God, but so it is. He wants life and thinks he can get it in this way."

I cannot quote all of this passage, but I am sure that it rests on a defective analysis. It would be a great mistake to tell the man who gets drunk that he is really seeking God, only in a blundering way. He knows better, but such an assurance may aid him in his self-deception. He knows that there are two impulses moving him when he confronts this question of the gratification of his appetite; the law in his members is warring against the law in his mind. The lower motive urges him to yield to the craving; the higher motive commands him to rule his appetite by his reason. And he knows that it is God who speaks through his higher motive, and that when he yields to the lower he is not seeking God, but shunning or defying Him. There is something worse here than a blunder; there is the weak or wilful repudiation of an ideal whose rightful sovereignty the soul acknowledges.

In all the gigantic egoisms in which men trample out the lives of their fellow men on their way to their own aggrandize-

ment the case is still clearer. Shall we say that the men who engineered the Amalgamated Copper deal or the Alton reorganization were engaged in a blundering quest for God? I think that we must absolve them from this imputation upon their sanity. They knew that their business was plunder, and they did not expect to find God in any transaction of that nature. Either they did not believe in God at all, or else they believed in a foolish God who could be wheedled by sentimental contritions and gifts to churches and charities.

To teach, therefore, that sin is only the mistake of a soul that is searching for God is greatly to mislead and confuse the moral judgment of men. I doubt whether any man ever really believed it, but it may often serve to dim the vision and confuse the judgment. That considerable teaching of this kind has been current, chiefly in literature and in the press, is true; and the failure of the church to awaken the conscience of men to the stern facts of the moral order may be due, in part, to this influence. It would seem that the appalling spectacles of moral turpitude which we have been witnessing during the past year or two might throw some light on the dark problem, and might at least raise the question whether the foundations of morality do not go a little deeper than this. And those of us to whom righteousness is something better than shrewdness, and sin something worse than foolishness, may find our convictions braced by a word like this from Felix Adler: "The moral law is not a convenience, nor a convention; it is not imposed in order that we may achieve happiness for ourselves or others. The moral law comes out of the infinite depths and heights. There is a voice that speaks to us out of the ultimate reality of things. It is not subject to us, but we are subject to it, and to it we must bend our pride. True, it is the expression of our own highest nature, which, so far, is consonant with the universal nature; but there is also a lower nature in us, and this we must subjugate to that higher leading."

It is not, however, to the prevalence of this pantheistic philosophy that the failure of the church to awaken the consciences of men is to be chiefly attributed. This philosophy could never stand before the onset of a convinced and positive moral purpose. The failure is really due to the feebleness and confusion of the church itself in its handling of the great problems of social morality. If the ethical insight of the church were clear and true upon the greater interests of the present hour, and if the church had the courage of her convictions, we might expect to see the moral forces assuming their proper sovereignty over human consciences. But it must be admitted that the church's dealing with practical morals, for the past generation or two, leaves much to be desired.

From certain sources we have been hearing, through all this time, frequent and strenuous demands for "the preaching of the law"; but these demands generally turn out to mean the preaching of penalty. There have been those who have thought it highly important that men should know what would happen to them if they incurred the penalty of the law; the much more important question, what is the law, what does it require and forbid, how does it apply to human life? has not been very carefully considered.

That sin is the transgression of the law, and that the wages of sin is eternal death has been stoutly preached by many, but for the most part in a vague and general way. There has been a great deal of lurid rhetoric about the exceeding sinfulness of sin and the fearful certainty of retribution, but the terms employed are mostly metaphysical and there is not much attempt to locate and define the sin. Generalities of this character are indubitably orthodox but they are not convincing. The listener wants particulars. He is prone to interrupt with a "For instance!" And it is when the attempt is made to specify that the weakness of the presentation appears.

Every one knows what kind of violations of the moral law are apt to be mentioned in the ordinary pulpit teaching. The

emphasis of the condemnation is sure to fall on drunkenness, profanity, Sabbath breaking, bad temper, evil speaking, and such like faults and vices; sometimes, also, the greater immoralities of gambling and impurity are boldly attacked. "Are not these, then, great evils?" you want to know. "Ought they not to come under the condemnation of the moral teacher?" Certainly: we cannot be silent about such transgressions.

But what was the sin of the Pharisees? It was largely the sin of disproportion. They put the emphasis on lesser things and ignored the greater. They kept the Sabbath strictly, but they were extortioners and robbers. They tithed mint and anise and cummin and neglected the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy and faith. It was this that brought down on them the thunderous woes of the all-compassionate Christ. It was this that paralyzed their influence as religious leaders and made them blind leaders of the blind. Must we not own that we have exposed ourselves to the same condemnation? The testimony of the church of these last generations against the environing iniquity has not been an adequate testimony. It has been petty and partial and puerile. It has put a great deal of emphasis on a few things, but it has not grappled, in any resolute and heroic fashion, with the mighty iniquity which is devastating society and consuming the souls of men.

Did you read, in a late magazine, that terrible revelation of the immoralities of Chicago? The evils of drink, of prostitution and of gambling are shown us there in all their hideousness. *But what is the motive-power of all this destructive work?* Listen:

"The city—from scarlet Babylon to smoky Chicago—has always been the great market place of dissipation. In the jungle you would call this thing savagery. In the city there is a new side to it. The dweller in the city—true to the instinct of city life—has made it a *financial transaction*. He has found it a *great source of gain, of easy money*. There has

grown up, therefore, a double motive in promoting it—the demand for the thing itself, and the stimulus of the great profit in providing it. You may call the sale of dissipation in the city savagery by retail. Ethically considered the thing is hideous beyond belief; socially considered it is suicidal. But to be understood and followed through intelligently, it must first be considered neither ethically nor socially. Its methods and motives are the methods and motives of pure business and must be considered as such. There is no other way. This is what I must recognize in describing conditions in Chicago. I must talk *cold business*, as the saying goes.”

Here is the motive power of this social destruction. It is simply covetousness, the love of money. When you are dealing with the social vices, on which the censure of the church mainly falls, the cardinal sin, after all, is the love of money. Under and behind the drunkenness and the gambling and the prostitution, the great procuring cause of all of them, is greed, covetousness, the love of money. The poverty, the sickness, the untimely death, the horrible crime which grow out of these rank vices are chargeable, in large measure, upon the love of money.

I do not forget that bestial appetites and wolfish passions have their part in this destruction; these are fuel for the conflagration, but the flame that kindles them is the love of money.

What is the chief reason why drunkenness destroys thousands of homes and tens of thousands of lives in Chicago every year? It is because \$115,000,000 can be secured every year from the sale of strong drink. What is the great reason why armies of young girls are lured to ruin every year in Chicago? It is because the business of prostitution amounts to \$20,000,000 a year. What is the strong reason why a multitude of souls go down every year to the gambler's hell? It is that the annual gross receipts of the gambling business in that city are not less than \$15,000,000. And one very intelligible reason why the municipal government of Chicago reeks with rotten-

ness is that corrupt officials and machine politicians are able to collect at least half a million of dollars a year from the purveyors of these vices as the price of their protection.

Similar conditions prevail in other cities. And thus we are able to see how all these gross fleshly vices owe a large part of their virulence to the love of money. "The love of money is a root of all kinds of evil." It is not "*the* root,"—the only root; the apostle does not say that; but it is a cause, and a most efficient cause of all these terrible social vices. And no ethical treatment of these vices is at all adequate which does not recognize the fact that covetousness furnishes the soil in which they grow and the aliment by which they are nourished. If this principle of covetousness could be eradicated from human nature, the evils of drunkenness and prostitution and gambling might not wholly disappear but they would be greatly lessened.

Here, then, we confront the one towering moral evil of these generations,—greed, covetousness, the inordinate love of money. Never before in history did Mammon attain such eminence. There have been ages when the highest social classes scorned the pursuit of gain; a gentleman could not be a money-maker. And it is only a little while ago that the vast majority of the population were slaves or serfs, from whom the possibilities of accumulating wealth were so distant that this motive scarcely touched their lives. But within the last century or two feudalism has passed; society has moved "from status to contract;" the laborer has been made free and the lists of gain have been thrown open to all comers. Some measure of opportunity, some measure of hope is offered to all.

And what a prodigious development of this passion for accumulation has the last century witnessed! The unprecedented multiplication of wealth stimulates, of course, the desire of wealth; supply creates demand; the relative importance of wealth, as compared with other objects of desire, has thus been greatly enhanced; and the effect of all these upon

human character is phenomenal. Among the springs of human action the love of money has a far larger place to-day than it had a hundred years ago; among the activities of men money-getting holds a rank in these times that it never held before in human history.

We must not overstate the case. This desire of wealth is not an unmixed evil. It is one of the natural human desires and has its part to play in the development of civilization, in the extension of the kingdom of heaven. Ruled by reason and love it is a strong servant of human welfare. There are a great many men and women in the midst of this money-loving generation who have learned to rule it by wisdom and love, and whose characters are not hurt by it; while there are not a few who would be far better off if this natural desire had a stronger place in their lives. All these things we must not fail to see. And yet, when every due qualification has been made, we are compelled to face the fact that the average American of to-day has in his nature a much larger element of greed than could be charged upon the average American of any preceding generation; that the sin of covetousness, as compared with other sins, stands out to-day in a bad pre-eminence to which it never before attained. It has, indeed, always been one of the deadly sins; the testimony of Jesus concerning it is startling, and the apostles all bore similar witness; but it must be perfectly evident to any student of history that the danger to the soul and to society from this sin was relatively far less in the apostolic times than it is to-day.

I have shown how it provides the culture medium by which all the social vices are propagated, but there are other consequences far more immediate and obvious and pervasive. The love of money furnishes, as we have seen, the motive to the purveyors of vice, and to the corrupters of government, and to the debauchers of politics; graft is its political synonym. But of the evils which infest the business world, the fraud, the

extortion, the dishonesty, the deceit, the continental oppressions, the gigantic plunder of conscienceless promoters, the colossal swindling of the frenzied financiers, the cold-blooded traducers of boards of trust,—of all such iniquities the love of money is the sole procuring cause. The astonishing and shameful revelations during the last two years of injustices almost incredible in the management of our railways; of breaches of trust in our great insurance companies; of revolting conditions in the great packing houses; of nefarious and flagitious violations of law by our biggest corporations,—all these things have no other explanation than the inordinate love of money.

And consider well what such a state of things implies with regard to human character. Can the effect of practises so heinous upon the souls of the men who are engaged in them be otherwise than deadly? We have been wont to extenuate the personal turpitude connoted by these transactions; we have been disposed to emphasize the extent to which good men have been involved in a bad system. But the personal deterioration cannot be ignored. One plain fact stands out, and it has left a stain which cannot be erased. All these exposures have been preceded by the most sweeping and indignant denials of the facts which afterwards have been proved in court. How shall we explain these denials? They cannot be attributed to ignorance. They reveal a grave shrinkage in mercantile honor. They make it very clear that the characters of men have been suffering terrible injury in the operations of grasping monopoly and frenzied finance.

And what must have been the effect upon the characters of the young men and women who have been looking on and listening during the last two generations? Can there be any doubt that their ideals have been lowered, that they have learned to admire a great deal which they ought to abhor, and that the feet of multitudes of them have been turned into the downward way?

Here, then, we confront the stupendous fact with which the Christian church has been called to deal during the last half century. If any prophetic function is hers, if she is called to bear testimony against the sin of the world this, surely, is the one sin against which she should have lifted up her voice in season and out of season. If "conviction of sin" has any meaning for this generation its cry for mercy would be extorted by the contemplation of this sin of covetousness. If the testimony of the church should have been clear and unequivocal and unsparing against any class of sinners it should have been those who were suffering their souls to be consumed by an inordinate desire for gain, and who, under the spur of this desire, were not only destroying themselves, but were filling the land with strife and desolation.

Has this been the attitude of the Christian church in the presence of this overshadowing evil? Has this sin been singled out and smitten as the deadliest of iniquities? I am sure than none of us can claim that it has been. This is not where the emphasis of the church's censure has been falling. It has borne witness against greed, but often in a timid and qualified way: it has not been made plain to the people of the last generations that the love of money is the one central, dominant, soul-destroying social evil. Certainly not. If you want proof, consider the fact that a pretty large share of the men whose colossal greed has been exposed in the recent investigations are in the churches. They have not found the atmosphere of the churches uncongenial. And the great majority of them, if you should suggest to them to-day that they ought to be under conviction of sin, and to be crying out "What must we do to be saved?" would look at you in blank amazement and wonder what might be the matter with you. That the muck-rakers have been after them they are aware, but it would surprise them to be told that the church has anything against them. This is what the church has done for them. It has not convinced them of sin. It has not tried very hard

to do it. It has reserved its thunders for other classes of offenders.

I take these sentences from a late magazine article. There is a wholesome bitter in them:

"The loss of moral leadership of the clergy is often deplored, but what else is to be expected when so many clergymen appeal to the feminine rather than the masculine conscience. To-day the virile, who see in graft and monopoly and foul politics worse enemies than beer, Sunday baseball and the army canteen, scoff when the pastor of the indicted boss of San Francisco pleads, 'He was never known to smoke or take a drink. He never was seen in front of a saloon bar.' . . . Our moral pacesetters strike at bad personal habits, but act as if there was something sacred about money-making; and, *seeing that the master iniquities of our time are connected with money-making* [italics not mine], they do not get into the big fight at all. The child-drivers, monopoly-builders, and crooked financiers have no fear of men whose thought is run in the moulds of their grandfathers. Go to the tainted-money colleges and you will learn that Drink not Graft is the nation's bane. Visit the religious societies for young men and you will find personal correctness exalted above the social welfare."*

That is the judgment of a man of the world upon the attitude of the church, and I fear that, in the main, it is a true judgment. There are ministers, I hope, of whom it is not true; respecting the church at large it is nearer true than I wish it were. And is it not plain that a church of which anything like this is true can have no power to arouse the conscience of this generation? For a testimony so lacking in proportion, so stammering and feeble in the places where it ought to be firm and strong, the majority of sinners can have no respect. The preacher may hammer away as hard as he pleases on the sins which he finds it safe to assail, but when he lets the giant wrong of the generation go scatheless he gets

* Atlantic Monthly, Vol. 99, No. 4, pp. 504-505.

no answer from the unbelievers he would convert but a scoff or a sneer.

In short, my friends, the time has come when judgment must begin at the house of God. The church has not dealt courageously and faithfully with the great business entrusted to her. It was her business to testify, in these intense years through which we have been passing, to the deadly influence of covetousness upon the life of men and nations, and for the most part she has been a dumb witness. There was no other truth that these generations so much needed, and she has not given it convincing utterance. Thus she has greatly discredited herself; thus she has lost the power to appeal, with commanding voice, to the conscience of men.

Can the church regain this power? Most assuredly she can. All she has to do is to accept the truth herself, and shape her own life in accordance with it, and then speak it out, without wrath or doubting.

I do not by any means wish to overlook the fact that the church is already, in many quarters, convinced of its failure, and awake to its responsibility. Here are words that were ringing, only two weeks ago, in the ears of the people of one of our oldest New England churches:

"There are evils to-day so much worse than beer and Sunday picnics that these latter seem to fade out of sight. Booze is bad enough, and men ought to keep the Sabbath. But while we waste our bird-shot on this little game, the big violators of the law of God and man go on their own sweet wicked way. It takes no courage now to shake the saloon-keeper over Hades—and he deserves it. But to rebuke a greed which would devour widows' houses without any sauce, and carries whole insurance companies in its vest pockets, and appropriates a railroad and pawns the people's interests in a little game of political chicanery,—this would make some of our ossified Christians, who have thought that mauling the rum business was the whole duty of man, lift up their heads in holy terror."*

* Rev. F. L. Goodspeed.

Words like these can be heard here and there, and we may trust that they are but the prelude of a chorus of testimony which will ring and reverberate from all our pulpits until the conscience of the people shall be thoroughly awakened, and the terrible nature of this soul-destroying sin of covetousness shall be brought home to them.

It is not the only sin—we must not say that; but we must learn to discern its enormity and to put it, in its proper perspective, before the thoughts of men. If we could do that, to-day; if we could make men see how absolutely true are the words of Jesus, when he points out the deadly perils that lie in the love of money; if we could convince them of the truth of Paul's saying that covetousness is idolatry,—and the most degrading of all idolatries, we might hope to arouse many consciences that have been narcotized in the poisonous atmosphere of the mart, and to hear from many a troubled soul the cry, "What shall we do to be saved?"

Need enough they have of salvation—these multitudes who are pouring out the energies of their lives on the altars of Mammon; whose manhood is being gradually subdued, like the dyer's hand, to the element of greed it works in; who are gaining the world and losing themselves! Is there any deeper need than this, in the characters of the majority of the people you know—any deeper need than the need of salvation from the inordinate love of gain? And would we not be sure that the Kingdom of God was coming with power, if we could see that the people round about us who love money too well were convinced that this passion was a curse to them and to all their neighbors, and were crying to God that they, and the communities in which they live, might be saved from it? What shape could salvation take, in this day and generation, more benign than this? How much is any salvation worth which does not include this?

What answer, now, would you give if you should hear that cry from the multitude? Would it not be the same answer

that the apostolic prisoners gave to the Ephesian jailer: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ." And I think that we could let them take these words in their very simplest sense. To the people of this generation whose lives are being spoiled in their delirious worship of Mammon what better thing could you say than bid them believe in Jesus Christ—not in any mystical, transcendental, theological way, but in a perfectly natural child-like way—just to believe what he says, and live by it. And it is what he says about the world and the life we are living in it that they need, first of all, to believe. We are fain to put the emphasis on what he is supposed to have said or done with reference to patching up breaches in the divine government, or to reconstructing the heavenly jurisprudence, and these things are sometimes difficult to understand; but really it is most needful to heed what he says about the life that we are to live, from day to day, here in this world. Nearly all the trouble and misery of this world are caused by our failure to heed what he tells us about the meaning of this life, and the ways in which happiness may be found.

And if the people who are beginning to be conscious that covetousness is death, and who want to be saved from it, would sit down and let him teach them what life means, and would believe what he tells them, *they would be saved.*

Must it not be so? If we really believe what he says about the terrible danger of letting ourselves go in the mad quest of gain; if we believe him when he tells us that a man's life consists not in the abundance of the things which he possesses; if we believe him when he counsels us not to be anxious about what we shall eat or drink or wherewithal we shall be clothed; if we can trust his assurance that our heavenly Father knows what we need, and that when we have done our honest best we may safely leave ourselves in his hands; if we can take the yoke of Jesus upon us and learn of him,—not so much about the mysteries of theology as about the real meaning of life in this world; if we can let him show us how to trust our Father

in heaven, and how to treat our brethren on the earth; if by sitting at his feet and learning of him we can come to understand how we are to get the good of life, and what is really worth while—then, oh then, *we shall be saved!*

Is there any other way of salvation? I do not know of any. I have not found anyone else who seemed to know a better way. I do not believe that Plato or Macchiavelli, or Ricardo or Karl Marx or August Bebel can save us. The way of Jesus is, I believe, the way of salvation; and there is no other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved.

II.

THE BROWN-DRIVER-BRIGGS HEBREW-ENGLISH LEXICON.

BY IRWIN HOCH DE LONG, D.B., PH.D.

This lexicon is based on the lexicographical works of WILHELM GESENIUS, who was born February 3, 1786, at Nordhausen, a town situated on the southern slopes of the Harz Mountains, Germany. In 1809 GESENIUS became professor in Halle and died there in 1842 on the twenty-third of October. The work of this great German professor, in Hebrew lexicography, in Hebrew grammar, and in Semitic epigraphy is of continuing value. EWALD, however, one of the Göttingen seven ("einer der Göttinger Sieben!"), subsequently inaugurated by his keenness and originality a new era in Hebrew grammar. Nevertheless it remains true that GESENIUS, by his work, has placed all subsequent students in this large and important field under the greatest lasting obligation to himself and his untiring diligence, and thereby won for himself an immortal name that might well be envied. Gesenius is more than "the father of modern Hebrew Lexicography"; he is both the father and the master, using the latter term in a somewhat restricted sense, as is once more evidenced by this latest Hebrew-English Lexicon: "As to the arrangement of the work, the Editors [of the work in question] decided at an early stage of their preparations to follow the *Thesaurus* [of GESENIUS], and the principal dictionaries of other Semitic languages, in classifying words according to their stems, and not to adopt the purely alphabetical order which has been common in Hebrew dictionaries." * This change, let us say in passing, to an older and more scientific arrangement is to

* Preface, page vii.

be heartily commended; it is the only method of arranging a Hebrew, or Semitic vocabulary, because it is the scientific method. DELITZSCH is right in his constant and persistent insistence upon German lexicographers of the Hebrew language to return to this arrangement of the Hebrew vocabulary. It is, however, not only in the matter of arrangement, but in other aspects of his work as well, that the masters of our age acknowledge GESENIUS' keen and acute philological insight, his strong good sense, and the continuing value to-day of his lexicographical works. PROFESSOR DRIVER, himself one of the leading English Hebraists, and also one of the editors of the present work, has said, in other places, of one of the leading masters in Semitic scholarship of our age, PROFESSOR NÖLDEKE: "In questions of Semitic philology, the guidance of Nöldeke, where it can be obtained, is invaluable";* "to differ from Professor Nöldeke on a point of Aramaic or Arabic usage would be to court certain error."† The home of this "little giant," as American scholars‡ already years ago delighted to call NÖLDEKE, is also in the Old World, not in Halle, but in Strassburg, and his "contributions to Hebrew lexicography and grammar have been constantly used" in the present work. This modern master in Semitic scholarship still finds the *Thesaurus* of GESENIUS indispensable and turns to it whenever he has occasion to use a Hebrew dictionary, as he has told the writer more than once when a student of his. PRESIDENT HARPER sent his students in his seminar work in the University of Chicago constantly to the *Thesaurus* of the Halle professor. In March, 1892, PROFESSOR DRIVER said of GESENIUS that he "still retains his place as the master of Hebrew Lexicography." Systematic theologians likewise, who, however, as a rule have little knowledge of the Hebrew language

* *Hebrew Tenses*, page xii, note 2.

† HASTINGS' *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. IV, p. 582 f.

‡ *Hebraica*, vol. VII, 1891, p. 232: . . . "the little giant" of Strassburg, Professor Nöldeke, generally recognized as the leading Semitic scholar of the world." See also REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW, October, 1906, p. 581 f.

and still less of the Semitic languages, but who have the good grace of allowing merit to detailed linguistic study, seem also willing to acknowledge merit to the work of this German savant; thus, a systematic theologian acknowledged in a recent work in the form of the following question the indebtedness of Biblical Science to the philological work of GESENIUS: "What most rabid opponent of criticism is not ready to own his indebtedness, on the linguistic side, to that dry old rationalist, Gesenius?" In the presence of such testimony and with our own acquaintance with the work of this scholar, it is just what we look for when we find the editors of this work freely acknowledging their indebtedness to GESENIUS, not only in the title of their work, but also in the "Preface": "The Editors have made use of the *Thesaurus* of Gesenius on every page, with increasing admiration for the tireless diligence, philological insight and strong good sense of this great Lexicographer."

Notwithstanding the abiding value of the lexicographical works of GESENIUS, there was need of a new Hebrew-English lexicon of the Old Testament. This need has long since been felt by those who are teaching Hebrew and by those who are not content with a mere superficial knowledge of the Old Testament and its languages. ROBINSON's Gesenius, or TREGELLES' English edition of 1859, were only recommended to English speaking students because there was no Hebrew-English lexicon more satisfactory than these. While the value of the work of GESENIUS will abide, nevertheless by reason of the vigorous work that has been done in the Semitic field since GESENIUS and since the appearance of the last Hebrew-English lexicon in 1859 the final completion and appearance of this new Hebrew-English lexicon can only be a matter of gratification to every friend and student of Old Testament science. The energetic work that has been done in the Semitic field since the appearance of the last Hebrew-English lexicon is well characterized by the editors in their preface: "The language and text of the Old Testament have

been subjected to a minute and searching inquiry before unknown. The languages cognate with the Hebrew have claimed the attention of specialists in nearly all civilized countries. Wide fields of research have been opened, the very existence of which was a surprise, and have invited explorers. Arabic, ancient and modern, Ethiopic, with its allied dialects, Aramaic, in its various literatures and localities, have all yielded new treasures; while the discovery and decipherment of inscriptions from Babylonia and Assyria, Phoenicia, Northern Africa, Southern Arabia, and other old abodes of Semitic peoples, have contributed to a far more comprehensive and accurate knowledge of the Hebrew vocabulary in its sources and its usage than was possible forty or fifty years ago. In Germany an attempt has been made to keep pace with advancing knowledge by frequent editions of the *Handwörterbuch*, as well as by the brilliant and suggestive, though unequal *Wörterbuch* of Siegfried and Stade (in 1892-93), but in England and America there has not been heretofore even so much as a serious attempt."

The work of this lexicon was undertaken twenty-three years ago, and the first part of it appeared in 1891. Since that time the various parts made their appearance slowly at intervals. In the meantime the German Gesenius passed through a number of editions. In 1890 appeared the eleventh German edition of Gesenius under the editorship of PROFESSORS MÜHLAU and VOLCK, of Dorpat; in 1895 the twelfth, which also marks a new era in this valuable and convenient dictionary, under the editorship of PROFESSOR FRANTZ BUHL, of Leipzig, now at Copenhagen; in 1899 PROFESSOR BUHL issued the thirteenth edition; and in 1905 the fourteenth, a thorough revision of the preceding edition. Accordingly the German Gesenius passed through three editions within the fifteen years, the time required (1891-1906) for the complete appearance of this new English edition; the latter, so the editors inform us, was almost entirely in type, save the "Appendix," when the latest German edition appeared. Conse-

quently adequate use of the "new material" could not be made by our editors in the body of their work, for which they express their regrets and hope for a "later opportunity," and elsewhere in the "Preface" speak of "a possible future edition of the Lexicon."

While the lexicon under consideration is based on older works, as indicated above, it nevertheless has its own distinguishing characteristics, and though it is already followed by a later German edition of Gesenius, its scope is somewhat different from that of the German Gesenius, or GESENIUS-BUHL, as it is now more commonly called.

This lexicon contains a very large number of articles marked with a †, indicating that all passages in the Old Testament are cited, in which the word, at the head of the article, occurs. In cases where the number of occurrences of a given Hebrew word is too great for complete citation the frequency of the word is indicated by small inferior figures placed immediately after the word. In this way the lexicon, to a considerable extent, takes on the character of an analytical concordance.

It is, however, not only important to know the number of times a given word occurs, but in some instances at least, it is important to know the number of times it occurs in independent writers. When a word occurs in a later book, in a passage quoted from an earlier writer, this should be indicated, likewise parallel passages where there may not be a direct quotation, but a very strong literary dependence, as, for instance, Chronicles upon the earlier Historical Books. Thus, as an example, I Chronicles 19¹³ is clearly a parallel of II Samuel 10¹² (page 305, column 1, *sub* Hithp.), though not indicated as such, and consequently the actual independent occurrence of *pn* is only 290 rather than 291 times, provided there is no other such parallel or dependent usage of this word. I am not now concerned so much about this word as about this principle which should be consistently applied to all articles in which an attempt is made to indicate the frequency of a given Hebrew word. The small inferior figure

after a given Hebrew word should indicate the actual number of occurrences of the word, while parallel and dependent occurrences should be indicated by some means in the article itself. Generally this dependence is indicated as, for example, under **שָׁאָן**, thus, "Je. 25^{30a} = Am. 1² = Jo. 3¹⁶," and under **שָׁקָה**, thus, "I Sam. 2¹⁶ = I Ch. 15²⁹"; here there is however an error, the first passage should be II Sam. 6¹⁶. In the case of these two words the number of occurrences is, however, not indicated, but what we are now more particularly concerned about is, that this system of indicating such dependent occurrences of a word be consistently applied, and especially in such articles where the number of occurrences is indicated by small inferior figures after the word. I name here such articles that came to my notice where this literary dependence is not, but where it should be indicated: **אֶחָדָה**, Ex. 28¹⁹ = 39¹²; **חֲרָשִׁים**, Ex. 28²⁰ = 39¹³; **נֶסֶף**, Ex. 28¹⁸ = 39¹¹; **יָשָׁם**, Ex. 28²⁰ = 39¹³, here there is indicated in parentheses the document, which should be indicated in all these passages, thus, (both P); **יָהֵל**, Ex. 28¹⁸ = 39¹¹; **לָשָׁם**, Ex. 28¹⁹ = 39¹²; **שָׁהָם**, Ex. 28⁹ = 39⁶, Ex. 28²⁰ = 39¹³; **סָפִיר**, Ex. 28¹⁸ = 39¹¹; **אָרָם**, Ex. 28¹⁷ = 39¹⁰; **בָּרָקָה**, Ex. 28¹⁷ = 39¹⁰; **פָּהֵל**, Ex. 28^{28 37} = 39^{21 31}; **בָּמָה**, II Kgs. 19¹⁰ = Isa. 37¹⁰; **אֶרְפֶּלֶךְ**, II Kgs. 19³⁷ = Isa. 37³⁸. I also call attention here to the article, **מָרוֹם**, p. 929, top, where, instead of "**לְמַ** towards heaven, Is. 38^{14 40²⁶}, 37²³ = 2 K 19²²," it would be more accurate to register the passages as follows: **לְמַ** towards heaven, Isa. 38¹⁴; **מַ** 40²⁶, 37²³ = II Kgs. 19²²; the preposition **לְ** is wanting in the three last mentioned passages.

The system of indicating synonymous or contrasted words in the same passage, by two vertical parallel lines, thus ||, is an excellent feature running through the lexicon. So, for instance, under **שָׁאָן** we are at once informed that **יִשְׁאֲנִיָּקוּל**, Job 37⁴, is in parallelism with **יָרַעַם**, or, again, that **מִנְרֵנוֹת** in II Chron. 32²³ is in parallelism with **מִנְחָה**; this may frequently be a help, as it is in the latter case, in determining the meaning

of words. In this connection of indicating parallel, synonymous, and contrasted words in the same passage, I call attention to Psalm 37⁷ where **בְּמַצְרוֹת**, the meaning of which is clear, is in parallelism with **בְּנֵר**, translated, "as a heap [of waters]." The parallelism, however, suggests **בְּנֵר** = **בְּנֶאֱר**, "like a water-skin." The translation would then read: "He gathereth the waters of the sea together as in a water-skin: He layeth up the deeps in store-houses." On the loss of א in **נֶאֱר**, compare such words as **רִמִּים** = **רִמְסִים**, Psalm 22²; **סִלְחָךְ** = **סִלְחָךְ**, I Chron. 21²⁰; **יִבְאוּ** = **יִבְנוּ**; **הַמּוֹל** = **הַמּוֹל**; **מִאֲכַלְתָּ** = **מִכַּלְתָּ**, 21²⁰; and GES.-KAUTZSCH²⁷, § 23 f, § 74 k, and such cases in modern Arabic as *rās* = *ra's*. The ancient versions on this passage, Psalm 33⁷, such as LXX, Aq., Sym., H., Peš., and Tar., indicate also that we should read here **נֶאֱר** or **נֵר** rather than **נֵר**; see, however, on the other hand, Quinta. Subsequently I find in the article **כַּס** this statement in connection with the passage, Psalm 33⁷, "rd. perh., for **בְּנֶאֱר** as in a wine skin," with a reference to **נֶאֱר** and **נֵר**. Evidently the editor had in mind to add this passage to the article **נֶאֱר**, inasmuch as the latter is marked with a †, but it seems to have escaped his attention.

The above passage may also be taken as an example to show how the work of the textual critic influences the work of the lexicographer. The Masoretic text, or the text of our present Hebrew Bible, reads **בְּנֵר**, the context or the parallelism rather suggests **בְּנֵר** = **בְּנֶאֱר**, supported also externally by the versions as indicated above. As is well known the ancient versions were, of course, made before the current system of vocalization came into vogue. From the above it is clear then that the lexicographer of the language should give this word and passage a place under **נֵר** = **נֶאֱר** rather than under **נֵר**, "heap," as the editor apparently had intended.

Examples might easily be multiplied under this heading. Let it suffice, however, to add another single instance by way of further illustration. In the article **חִפְשָׁה** under Hithp. the

form הָתְהַיִּשׁ , in I Kgs. 22³⁰ = II Chron. 18³⁰, is registered as an infinitive absolute, and rightly so. But if we turn to the context misgivings as to the correctness of the form, הָתְהַיִּשׁ וְבָא , arise, even though the infinitive instead of the finite verb is used as a cohortative in a few instances (see GES.-KAUTZSCH,²⁷ § 113, dd), which HAUPT in STADE,* *in loco*, is, however, apparently not willing to allow in this passage. Here where the context turns on the antithesis between אֲנִי and אַתָּה , with the latter alone expressed, the unequivocal designation of the first person is naturally expected. It may be that originally וְבָא instead of וּבָא stood in the text, and was to be read וְבָא . This would then be another case of the loss of כ , as in the words above, and as in Kethîb מִכָּה equals the usual מֵאֻמָּה . After וְבָא was read as an infinitive instead of as the first person imperfect, the next thing that would naturally take place was to read the preceding word also as an infinitive instead of as the first person imperfect. In this way the original $\text{שָׁמַעְתָּ$ became $\text{שָׁמַעַתְּ$ (compare KITTEL). Further, the external evidence of the ancient versions supports this conjecture, thus LXX: $\sigma\upsilon\gamma\kappa\alpha\lambda\upsilon\phi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ καὶ εἰσελεύσομαι; Peš.: ܐܡܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ; Tar.: $\text{אֲנִי אֶשְׁמַע וְאַתָּה}$. The lexicographer must take account of such textual evidence and build up his lexicon accordingly. No account is taken of this evidence on this form in the present lexicon.

Numerous instances, similar to the above, might be cited, where textual or lower criticism influences lexicography. Textual emendations suggested by the context and supported by the external evidence of the best ancient versions rightly claim a place in a modern Hebrew lexicon. Concerning the value of emendations based solely upon the demands of a still questionable meter, without the external support of the versions, skepticism may be justifiable. All that can be asked of the modern lexicographer, in this connection, is that he bases his work on the relatively assured results of the textual critic.

* *The Books of Kings* in SBOT.

Now it is true, as already intimated, that the last word in textual criticism has not yet been spoken. Apart from the problem of meter, much work of a preliminary character remains to be done. So, for instance, our chief external witnesses must themselves be subjected to a careful critical study. In spite of this, it seems to me, a lexicon like the one under consideration, even though it represents, as it is, a large step in advance of preceding Hebrew-English lexicons, should give more attention to the work already done by scholars in this department of Biblical science. There are numerous emendations, suggested by the context and supported by good external authority, which may safely be regarded as more than mere conjectures, even though absolute certainty of their correctness may be wanting. On the other hand, there is many an emendation offered merely on subjective grounds which can have little abiding value and as such may be passed by quietly by the lexicographer. That much work of an abiding value along this line has already been done is recognized by the editors in their "Preface," but in the body of their work they are hardly as liberal in their acknowledgment as we are led to believe from the prefatory statement. The list of textual works named as having been used by them in their work is a good one, but some of these works are too recent to have been used in the earlier part of their work, and others in the list seem at times to have received a somewhat sparing recognition. The editors themselves apparently feel that their work in this respect is not what they would like it to be. We quote a sentence from their "Preface": "There is still much to do in textual criticism, and much which has been done since the printing of this Lexicon began would receive recognition if extensive revision were now possible." To give us, then, a lexicon up to the present state of scholarship in textual criticism, an "extensive revision" of the present work would be necessary. It is to be hoped that the "later opportunity" for making use of the "new material" will soon present itself. KITTEL'S *Biblia Hebraica* (1905) is now an additional, con-

venient and welcome help to all those interested in this department of knowledge.

Just as the modern lexicographer bases his work on the relatively assured results of the lower or textual criticism, so he must also take account of the higher or literary criticism. This is especially the case when the lexicographer is working with the language of a literature, like the Hebrew of the Old Testament, extending over a period of about a thousand years. Here the usage of the different Biblical writers and of the different periods is to be noted. This the editors have carried out quite consistently, giving the history of words within the literature itself by indicating the book and passage, and, as in the case of the Hexateuch, by adding in parentheses the current designation of the documents. The Hexateuchal documents are, however, not always indicated, as we have noted above. In a future edition it would be well to give more attention to this matter and indicate the documents with more of completeness. The time will doubtless come when lexicographers will also have to take account of the later interpolated passages,* as those in the prophetic books, and register the given words and passages accordingly.

In the lexicon before us the various inflectional forms, whether verb, noun, or adjective, are registered at the head of each article. These forms are tabulated with the citation following, making it convenient for the student and enabling him without much loss of time to turn to the context, which is

* See an article in the *REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW*, October, 1902, *The Euphemistic Principle as Applied to the Old Testament*, by DR. GAST. In the course of this article on page 469f we come across this paragraph: "However surprising at first sight later additions may appear, their existence, whether due to euphemism or to some other principle, becomes ever more apparent as we study the Old Testament with an open and candid mind." The paragraph concludes with a quotation from PROFESSOR FRANCIS BROWN in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. XV, p. 69, and with a quotation from the judicious GEORGE ADAM SMITH, *The Book of the Twelve Prophets*, vol. I, p. ix. Both these writers voice the same conviction. Compare also MARTI, *Die Religion des Alten Testaments*,³ p. 2; and the recent commentaries.

always important in studying unusual inflectional forms. Here there is much improvement on preceding lexicons. To mention only a single instance, the form קָל is clearly the Kā participle, and hence it, together with its various inflectional forms is rightly classed among the inflectional forms of the verb קָל , instead of placing these forms, as is customary, in separate articles as verbal adjectives. Other and similar cases might be mentioned here, but instead we ask whether it would not be more nearly correct to place the form קָלָה , Gen. 27²¹, under the root קָלָה rather than under קָל where it is now? In the same chapter, verses 12 and 22, there occur the forms קָלָה and קָלָה ; both forms are clearly from the *medix geminata* root. קָלָה . The d. f., then, in קָלָה would be rejected because of the simple š'wā under the ש . That the d. f. appears in קָלָה of the form קָלָה , Num. 6²⁵, is due to the pausal קָלָה . Without being in pause the pointing might be קָלָה , as if from a root קָל . Moreover, as a Kā or Kā imperfect of קָלָה the form is a *ἀπαξλεγόμενον*. See also GES.-KAUTZSCH,²⁷ § 67r, where the form קָלָה Gen. 27²¹, is regarded as an "Anschluss an die Analogie der Verba קָלָה ".

We are heartily grateful to the editors of this lexicon that they have included the comparative philological material, and have not followed the example of SIEGFRIED and STADE in this respect. STADE's position that the meaning of the Hebrew words and stems has to be ascertained largely by carefully noting and comparing the passages of the Old Testament in which the given words occur, is, indeed, a principle that we must not lose sight of in our work. The lexicographer, as well as the textual critic, must begin with the context, and only as a rule proceed from this to external helps or witnesses. While this is true, we can, on the other hand, not afford to neglect these external helps; in lexicography these are the results of comparative philology, and in textual criticism the tes-

timony of the ancient versions.* Indeed, STADE himself, just before his lamented death (Dec. 6, 1906), seems to have had it in mind to prepare a new edition of his lexicon in which was to be given a rightful place to the comparative material which the languages cognate with the Hebrew, especially Arabic and Assyrian, afford.†

Here I am impelled to make use of the opportunity to call the attention of my readers to the fact that Arabic in this connection is of more importance than Assyrian, though considerable light has been thrown by Assyriology on lexical questions, not only in Hebrew, but also in Aramaic. For the light thrown by Assyriology on the Aramaic vocabulary one may with profit consult, for instance, JENSEN'S Assyriological contributions to BROCKELMANN'S *Lexicon Syriacum* (1895). The light which Assyriology is throwing on the Hebrew vocabulary is constantly held aloft, especially by the energetic DELITZSCH, in his *Prolegomena*, as well as in other places. On this question of the relative importance of Arabic and Assyrian for the Hebrew lexicographer the following quotation from the prominent Heidelberg Assyriologist and Semitic scholar, BEZOLD, is well worth the consideration of all those interested in Hebrew and Old Testament studies, and especially of those who may be disturbed by the Pan-Babylonian wave momentarily passing over us: "Es kann indessen nicht genug betont werden, dass

* The same principle is expressed by DR. GAST in an article, *The Claims of the Semitic Languages*, in the REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW, January, 1881, p. 146: "It must be remembered that the Old Testament is but a fragment of a more extensive Hebrew literature that has perished. It is not surprising that it contains many words which are found but once in the whole compass of its books, or which bear a peculiar sense once, though found often, it may be, with other senses. Now in such cases the student of the Bible will realize that a knowledge of the other Semitic languages, and of the ancient Semitic versions is invaluable. A word may occur but once in Hebrew, but its root will be found in some of the cognate dialects, by means of which its meaning may be ascertained. And where there still is doubt we have in the old translations the benefit of the knowledge of those who lived at a time when the consciousness of the language had not altogether died out."

† See ZATW, Heft I, 1907, p. xiv.

das Assyrische als Hilfsmittel zum Studium des Hebräischen *weit überschätzt* worden ist: vergl. hierüber . . . NÖLDEKE, ZDMG, 40, 718 ff. Auch heutzutage wird man gut tun, sich immer dessen bewusst zu bleiben, dass ein wirklich nutzbringendes Studium der semitischen Sprachen stets vom *Arabischen* auszugehen hat. Ohne die *Schulung* durch die Pflege des Arabischen wird weder der Assyriologe dem Hebräisten, noch dieser dem Keilschriftforscher ein verlässiger Führer sein." Six sevenths of the Hebrew roots, it may be added, are to be found in the Arabic lexicon.

Then, too, it must be remembered that there is an immense literature in Arabic, a literature belonging to the past and a growing literature of the present. The character of the former may be learned by a perusal of the various histories of Arabic literature, especially those by BROCKELMANN in German, and the one by HUART in English, translated from the French; the character of the latter may be learned from the various catalogues issued by the different Arabic publishing houses, such as *al-Machriq* in Syria, and *al-Hilal* in Egypt, and others. The present day literature includes works on history, the history of civilization, poetry, fiction, grammar and philology, mathematics, natural science, the standard dictionary of the language, and a cyclopædia even now appearing which will form a library by itself. This cyclopædia will consist of about twenty volumes, each containing from six hundred to eight hundred pages. Then there is also a large journalistic literature. At present more than one hundred Arabic newspapers and magazines are regularly published with an immense circulation in all parts of the Arabic-speaking world, as well as beyond in the University centers of Europe and America.

There is also a considerable Arabic literature in fiction growing up in our own English-speaking country. Consult, for instance, the catalogue of *al-Hoda*, one of the several Arabic newspapers published in New York. A volume of fiction, published by *al-Hoda* in 1904, was recently handed to me from a personal library, by an Arab of our own city. The scene of this Arabic novel is laid in Montclair, New Jersey!

The Arabic language is not only alive to-day in literature, but it is the vernacular of a large number of people spread over a very large portion of the globe. The Arabic language is said by the REV. GEO. E. POST, M.D., of Beirut, Syria, to be more extended over the face of the earth and to have had more to do with the destiny of mankind than any other, except English. The spread of this language over the earth to-day is graphically sketched by another in the following paragraphs: "Two languages have for past ages contested for world-wide extension on the basis of colonization and propagandism—the English and the Arabic. To-day about seventy millions of people speak some form of the Arabic language, as their vernacular; and nearly as many more know something of its literature in the Koran because they are Mohammedans. In the Philippine islands the first chapter of the Koran is repeated before dawn paints the sky red. The refrain is taken up in Moslem prayers at Peking and is repeated across the whole of China. It is heard in the valleys of the Himalayas and 'on the roof of the world.' A few hours later the Persians pronounce these Arabic words and then across the Peninsula the muezzins call the 'faithful' to prayer. At the waters of the Nile, the cry '*Allahu akbar*' is again sounded forth, ever carrying the Arab speech westward across the Sudan, the Sahara and the Barbary States until it is last heard in the mosques of Morocco."

"The Arabic Koran is a text-book in the day-schools of Turkey, Afghanistan, Java, Sumatra, New Guinea, and Southern Russia. Arabic is the spoken language not only of Arabia proper but forces the linguistic boundary of that peninsula three hundred miles north of Bagdad to Diarbekr and Mardin, and is used all over Syria and Palestine and the whole of northern Africa."

On the wealth of the Arabic vocabulary* let me quote briefly

* Of the character of the language the brilliant French Semitic scholar, ERNEST RENAN, speaks as follows in his *Histoire générale des langues sémitiques*, p. 342: "Cette langue, auparavant inconnue, se montre à

from the book *Arabia: The Cradle of Islam*, by REV. S. M. ZWEMER, a member of the American Arabian Mission, and a member of the Reformed (Dutch) Church. The book, though there is no dearth of literature on Arabia, is an interesting and instructive contribution to the literature on its subject, the geography, people and politics of the Arabian peninsula with an account of the religion of Islam and mission-work. It is written from the missionary standpoint. Our missionary societies who may want to study this field would do well to add this book to their list, inasmuch as books on Arabia from the missionary standpoint are limited to a few biographies, such as the biographies of BISHOP FRENCH and KAMIL ABD-UL-MESSIAH, and above all that of ION KEITH FALCONER, which has become a missionary classic. But this only by the way. The main point here is the quotation from this book on the lexical wealth of the Arabic language: "A second element of beauty is found in the lexical richness of the Arabic. Its boundless vocabulary and wealth of synonyms are universally acknowledged and admired. A dictionary is called a *Kamoos* or 'Deep Ocean' where 'full many a gem of purest ray serene, the dark unfathomed caves' conceal for the diligent student. Renan tells of an Arab linguist who wrote a book on the five hundred names given to the lion in literature; another gives two hundred words for serpent. Firozabadi, the Arabian Webster, is said to have written a sort of supplement on the words for honey and to have left it incomplete at the *eightieth* word; the same authority asserts that there are over one thousand different terms in Arabic for sword. . . . De Hammer Purgstall, a German scholar, wrote a book on the words relating to

nous soudainement dans toute sa perfection, avec sa flexibilité, sa richesse infinie, tellement complete, en un mot, que depuis ce temps jusqu'à nos jours elle n'a subi aucune modification importante. Il n'y a pour elle ni enfance, ni vieillesse; une fois qu'on a signalé son apparition et ses prodigieuses conquêtes, tout est dit sur son compte. Je ne sais si l'on trouverait un autre exemple d'un idiome entrant dans le monde comme celui-ci, sans état archaïque, sans degrés intermediaires ni tâtonnements."

the *camel* and finds them, in Arabic literature, to the number of 5,744. But this remarkable exhibition loses some of its grandeur when truth compels us to state that many of the so-called synonyms are epithets changed into substantives or tropes accidentally employed by some poet to conform to his rhyme" (p. 247 f).

The above may suffice to give the reader some idea of the importance of the Arabic language. To those interested in Arabic as illustrative of Hebrew may be recommended, as an introduction, Appendix III, pp. 176-245, of PROFESSOR DRIVER'S *Hebrew Tenses*.

To return to the matter of etymologies in the present lexicon we remark that we have noticed a number of silent omissions of etymologies which are still current in other lexicons, but are rightly omitted here. We have noted also some omissions of offered etymologies which in our opinion should have been included. About these latter omissions we may have something to say later in another place.

The effort made to explain the Hebrew proper names, which is not undertaken even in GES.-BUHL, is to be commended, difficult as it is and hazardous as it may have seemed at times. In the case of the name Solomon there is a possibility that the Hebrew שְׁלֹמֹן is the same as the Arabic سَلَامَانَ defined by FREYTAG as "nomen arboris." According to STADE, *Grammatik*, § 296a, the form שְׁלֹמֹן arose from שְׁלֹמֶן by attrition of the *l* finalis. With this statement, the statement of NÖLDEKE in the article *Names* in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, column 3303, is also in accord: "The *n* disappears in שְׁלֹמֶן, EV Solomon (= Arabic *Salāmān*), 'peaceable' or 'happy.'" Compare also the name in the LXX: Σαλωμων, Σαλομων, and Σολομων; further the modern Arabic form of the name: سُلَيْمَان; and finally the proposed etymology of שְׁמֹן = Arabic *Sim'an* from سِمْعَةَ, "pullus ex lupa matre et hyaena natus." All this indicates that שְׁלֹמֶן = שְׁמֹן =

سَلَامָן phonetically, and if one takes into consideration the numerous names in Israel, borrowed from the names of plants, the next step one is tempted to take is to identify שֶׁלֶם with سَلَامָן, "nomen arboris." If this is correct then the name Solomon should be classed among the personal names in Israel, borrowed from the names of objects of nature, such as plants, trees, etc., as שֶׁלֶם, שֶׁלֶם, שֶׁלֶם, etc., etc. With שֶׁלֶם, page 19, compare the personal name I-lu-na in MEISSNER's *Beiträgen zum altbabylonischen Privatrecht*, No. 4.

We can readily understand that the omission of the material of comparative philology would have "greatly simplified the task" of the editors. That "they have cheerfully assumed this burden"* calls for the gratitude of all who take a real interest in Old Testament studies.

SPIEGELBERG's illuminative Egyptological material is made use of, but mainly in the *addenda et corrigenda*, due, of course, to its recent appearance. SPIEGELBERG has, however, in a later publication than ZDMG, 53, (1899), p. 633 ff., withdrawn his conjectured, and untenable, etymology of מִן = i'w't, "Vieh," or corresponding in meaning to the Hebrew מִן: "Ich gebe damit die 'Vermutung' auf, die ich einmal in Zeitschrift der deutsch-morgenländischen Gesellschaft LIII S. 633 ff. geäußert habe. Auch aus den dort angeführten ägyptischen Namen von Jahvepriestern (Mose, Pinehas, Paschhur) folgt nicht notwendig eine religiöse Beeinflussung durch Aegypten."†

That the preposition בְּעַד does not have the meanings of *behind* and *about* I believe to have established against GRÄTZ‡ in my Strassburg dissertation.§ Nor do the ancient versions,

* See "Preface," p. vi.

† *Der Aufenthalt Israels in Aegypten im Lichte der ägyptischen Monumente*, 3 Aufl., 1904, p. 55, note 39.

‡ In the *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*, 28ter Jahrgang, 1879, pp. 49-61.

§ *Die Hebräische Präposition בְּעַד*, printed by Drugulin, Leipzig, 1905.

as my dissertation shows, support the rendering of the preposition by *behind*.^{*} Concerning the rendering *about* see especially page 16 of my dissertation under שָׁבֵר, and page 17f, under I Sam. 4¹⁸, Zech. 12⁸, and Ps. 3⁴.

In another place† I have called attention to the fact that נִיר הַנֶּשֶׁה in Gen. 32³³, suggests to modern anatomists the tendon of the *psaos* or of the *adductor longus*, rather than the *nervus ischiadicus* or sciatic nerve, because, among other reasons, the region of the groin (צֵד הַיָּרֵךְ) is in question.

We fear we have already transgressed the space allowed to this notice, but before we conclude we would like to call attention to עֹלָה, a religio-historical term. The statement in the lexicon that "the *whole-burnt-offering* (beast or fowl) is entirely consumed and goes up in the flame of the altar to God expressing the ascent of the soul in worship," contains too much to characterize the early conceptions of the עֹלָה. The עֹלָה designates that part of the sacrificial animal which is laid on the altar. As the designation of a specific kind of offering it signifies an offering in which the whole animal is laid on the altar and there consumed by fire, in accordance with which also the original and more exact designation of such offerings is כָּלִיל, "holocaust." I Sam. 7⁹ and other passages. It goes up to יְהוָה, conceived of as רִיחַ, as a רִיחַ הַנִּיחֹחַ, a sweet smelling savor, or, more literally, a quieting or tranquillizing odor. Again, it goes up as לְרִצּוֹן לֵפֶי יְהוָה or as לְרִצּוֹן פִּי, i. e., for acceptance of him who offers, or for acceptance for the offerer before Yahweh.

Merely to inhale or smell (וַיִּרַח יְהוָה אֶת רִיחַ הַנִּיחֹחַ) the odor of the sacrifice is conceived of as less sensual and less material for a being who is thought of as רִיחַ than the actual eating, according to a more primitive conception, of the things offered. For the conception that the things offered were eaten by the deity compare לֶחֶם אֱלֹהִים, God's food, and לֶחֶם אִשָּׁה לַיהוָה, and

^{*} Save the isolated renderings of Tar., בָּתֵּר, in only two passages, Judges 3²² and Lamentations 3¹, *ibid.*, p. 12, note 3, and p. 16, note 1.

† *Prohibitory Food Laws in Israel*, p. 224, in the REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW, April, 1907.

such expressions as "the table of Yahweh" and "the table that is before Yahweh," signifying the altar.

Here I desire to call the attention of the younger readers of the REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW to an interesting and instructive article on *The Origin and Development of the Idea of Sacrifices*. I am going to quote here a few sentences from this article, which are in general accord with what was said above, for the younger readers may not have ready access to this number of the REVIEW. It is presumed that the older readers are familiar with this article. The article in question appeared in the October number 1892, and is written by the REV. D. B. LADY, now the REV. DR. LADY. "As they [the reference is to primitive man in general] were accustomed to honor one another with gifts it dawned upon them no doubt that gifts might be acceptable to God. This conjecture is borne out by the fact that the original word for sacrifice is *Mincha* (מִנְחָה), which means a gift, a present, tribute, etc. . . ."

"The highest antique religions also show by unmistakable signs that in their origin sacrifices were regarded as 'the food of the gods.' In Leviticus, 21⁸ 17²¹, the sacrifice is called literally, 'food of the Deity' (לֶחֶם אֱלֹהִים). . . ."

"At first these gifts of pious worshippers were not consumed by fire. The sacred tree or stone by which the god was supposed to dwell was anointed with the oil or sprinkled with the blood offered to him in sacrifice, whilst libations of milk or wine were poured out beside them. . . . The Hebrew offering of the 'shew-bread,' or 'bread of the presence' was of this nature. It was placed upon a table, before the veil which closed the inner sanctuary. . . . Sacrifices to water-gods were cast into the sea, in harmony with the same general idea."

"Afterwards the Deity came to be conceived of as dwelling on high, and as being of a nature too refined and spiritual to partake of the coarse food upon which men sustained their lives. It was then thought that these offerings could be appropriated more readily by Him to whom they were made if they were first etherealized by fire. . . ."

"This is due to the general principle spoken of before, that the sacrifice was looked upon as a meal for the gods. Whatever was held to be the best meal for human beings was regarded as also constituting a proper sacrifice."

In this connection I also call attention to the well-wrought-out article by DR. GAST in the REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW, January, 1900, *The Idea of Sacrifice as Developed in the Old Testament*.

A comparative table of the Semitic alphabets, such as there is in GES.-BUHL, might be given a place in a future edition of this lexicon. Such a table would be serviceable especially to those users of the lexicon who have not yet sufficiently mastered the different Semitic alphabets, but yet are otherwise anxious to make use of the comparative philological material in the body of the work. The presence of such a table is accordingly also "a stimulus to study the cognate languages."

Just a word concerning the treatment of the Aramaic of the Old Testament. This is treated separately at the end of the lexicon on pages 1078-1118, instead of in one alphabetic series along with the Hebrew. This method of treatment gives the Aramaic, by lifting it out of the Hebrew vocabulary where former lexicographers were wont to embed it, its proper independence and quietly causes the student to feel that Aramaic is an independent language which has to be studied separately. This separate treatment is thus likely to prove an incentive to study this important language and its literature. The importance of a knowledge of this language for the New Testament student I have brought out in another place.* The Aramaic of the Old Testament, especially that

* *The Importance of a Knowledge of the Semitic Languages to the Proper Understanding of the New Testament*, in the REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW, October, 1906. My main contention in this article has met with general approval. European scholars, by letter, expressed their approval, so has also, among others, the Professor of New Testament Science in our Theological Seminary, DR. WM. C. SCHAEFFER. Before the article was read before the public it was submitted to the latter for criticism. A brief written criticism was handed to me in which, among other things, he said: "Your main contention will, I think, be readily granted."

In urging the importance of the Semitic languages, and in particular the

in the book of Daniel stands nearer to the time of Jesus and his disciples than any other that has come down to us thus far in literature.

The printing of the lexicon is remarkably clear and the proof-reading well done. On page 860, 2nd column, מִתְּבַר should be מִתְּבַר , and on page 188, 1st column, last line, read

Aramaic, upon theological students I was preceded by 26 years by my honored professor and friend DR. GAST, who addressed these words to the ministers and theological students of our church: "But we assure our younger ministers and theological students, that in the use of this version [the Peš.], they will be amply repaid for the little time and trouble necessary to master its language,—*that* language into which the New Testament was first translated, and which is almost identical with that spoken by our Lord and his disciples." REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW, April, 1880, p. 262.

What was true then, is still more so now, because of the epoch-making discoveries of 1892 and subsequently. Moreover, not only does the Old and New Testament student, who interests himself scientifically in his subject, need a knowledge of the Aramaic language, but the historian of early church history as well. It is generally acknowledged by those who have a right to a judgment in this matter that HARNACK's first volume of his *Dogmengeschichte* is the most original and characteristic, because it is based upon the author's own investigations of the original sources. Nevertheless, this excellent piece of work, now quite generally admired, is marred because of the learned historian's insufficient knowledge of the original sources in the Aramaic language. This is the opinion of those who know much more Aramaic than my little self. The many greater and lesser lights who use HARNACK's works as a source and go back no further, some of whom, perchance may not even know that among the source-material for early church history there are Aramaic sources, can, of course, not be allowed a voice in this matter scientifically. Even LOORS thinks the church historian rarely has occasion to use Syriac: "Ich wenigstens gestehe offen, dass die Kenntnis des Hebräischen und Syrischen, die ich in Lagardes Schule mir erworben hatte, sich in den seitdem verflossenen 26 Jahren nur verringert hat." To check "Dilettanten," LOORS said, at the same time, in the fall of the year 1906, that his knowledge of these languages was still sufficient. This state of affairs led NÖLDEKE, no doubt, to express himself as follows in the article, *Aramaic Language*, in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, column 285 f: "It is very desirable that theologians who interest themselves scientifically in the history of the first centuries of Christianity should learn some Syriac. The task is not very difficult for those who know Hebrew."

"for" instead of "or." The volume, it should be added here, is octavo in size and handsomely bound in half Russia leather.

We congratulate the Union Theological Seminary upon the appearance of this lexicon, and more particularly the two of its professors whose names appear on the title page as editors. These successors of the great ROBINSON seem to share a double portion of the spirit of their predecessor; they stand in the front ranks of American scholarship in Old Testament Science and in Semitics, a position which they attained by arduous labor and diligence. "Die kennis komt niet met het vak." The high character of this their joint work has shown to us anew "that the study of the Hebrew language and literature demands the same linguistic ability and scientific method that are indispensable to success in other fields of philological and literary research."* The work of these professors is a monument to American scholarship, resting upon the broad foundations laid by the untiring and learned master GESENIUS of the first half of the last century, built up by making use in a discriminating way, as wise builders, of the relatively assured results of the world's best modern scholarship in Semitics and in Old Testament science. In its structure go, speaking in a general way, the best results of comparative philology, textual and literary criticism, archæology, and some of the results of the science of the history of religions. It is truly a great work, though somewhat marred and unequal because of its slow appearance in *fasciculi* ever since 1891. Though strictly we cannot call it "up to date,"† nevertheless we would

* PROFESSOR NOSS in his Inaugural Address, *Scientific Theology*, 1905, p. 40.

† It is so characterized by HENRY PRESERVED SMITH in the *Biblical World*, April, 1907, in an instructive article, *General Survey of Work on the Old Testament*, p. 285: "For the first time in many years American students are in possession of a lexicon which may fairly be called up to date. The elaborateness of this work will make it a standard work for reference for a long time to come, and it is not likely to have a competitor." It may also be of interest to some readers to read in this connection the following from the *Literary Digest*, February, 1907, p. 263: "We regard this as the only extant lexicon of complete authority

not like to be without it, and we are glad that at last there is a standard Hebrew-English lexicon which can be used with profit and pleasure by beginners as well as by advanced students. We have recommended it to our classes in the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church, at Lancaster, Pa., and are now using it. We shall continue to recommend it until a better lexicon appears.

This lexicon should not call forth a rival, but now that it has appeared in its completeness the editors should continue to work and at suitable intervals put out new editions which present "the additional material which is now in their hands," according to the "Preface," and which keep pace with the rapidly advancing knowledge in the department of Old Testament science.

for English students. The references are copious, the printing and manufacture really exquisite, and the whole work is likely to prove a delight as well as a source of real help to the Hebrew scholar and student at every stage of his studies."

III.

THE POETRY OF LONGFELLOW.*

BY PROF. C. ERNEST WAGNER, A.M.

Is Longfellow, as some recent critics allege, merely the poet of the obvious and the commonplace? Or is he something more than this? That he was and continues to be widely popular there can be no doubt. Certainly no poet of our own land, no poet, it may be said, with the possible exception of Burns, has enjoyed so fully during his life-time the appreciation of his fellow-countrymen; no English poet since Byron has shared with him the distinction of "going round the world." Not only have reprints in the English language been made in several of the countries of continental Europe, but numerous translations occur in German, Dutch, Swedish, Danish, French, Italian, with a few versions of single poems in Portuguese, Spanish, Polish, Bohemian, Hungarian, and even Russian.

Testimony such as this may be used in one of two ways: to prove that the poet's appeal is, in his own age, well-nigh universal, or to demonstrate the presence in his work of the obvious and the commonplace. Homer, Dante, and Shakspeare are world poets, poets for all time; and yet, who would have the temerity to call them "popular" poets to-day? In America, certainly, Eugene Field, Whitcomb Riley, and Bliss Carman would better merit the title. The simple test of popularity is, therefore, an extremely hazardous one to employ. Thomas Hovenden's "Breaking the Home Ties" was, by all odds, the most popular single picture at the Chicago Exposition, in 1893. And why? Certainly not because of any marvelous skill in technique or any greatness of treatment, reveal-

* A paper read at a centenary celebration of the poet's birth, held in Lancaster, Pa., on the evening of February 27, 1907.

ing the touch of genius; but solely because the obvious, the familiar in the subject—sympathetically treated, to be sure—made its immediate appeal to the average mind and heart.

Troops of school children invading "Craigie House," to gaze admiringly at the far-famed arm chair, stacks of letters from Western worshippers, requesting autographs *en gros*, cosmopolitan assemblies in the saloons of steamers, each man or woman able, in turn, to contribute a verse or sentiment from the beloved poet,—these, truly, are evidences of popularity, which may or may not count for much in a serious attempt to estimate the poet's work.

It is unquestionably true that there is about many of Longfellow's best-known poems a touch of the familiar, the pathetic, and the simply natural that immediately wins all hearts. It is none the less true that there is about these same poems a certain facility of expression that is far enough removed from the "difficult" or "heightened style" of the greatest poets; there is a certain sweetness of melody that is bound soon to cloy, and a certain thinness of thought that must fail to satisfy the serious and cultivated mind. The widely popular, thoroughly hackneyed, and essentially commonplace "Psalm of Life" is an illustration in point.

There are, and I dare say will always be, school boys for whom the lilting measure and the mouth-filling phraseology of "Excelsior" constitute the acme of poetic excellence. Mature men and women may be permitted to wonder whether the fatuous hardihood of the hero and the unrelieved bathos of his fate can be in any way condoned by the somewhat hazy allegory or underlying moral purpose. With the questionable Latinity of the title the critics have had no end of sport, deriding especially the author's contention that the "adverbial use of the comparative adjective is justified by the best Latin writers."

And so one might range through Longfellow's verse, collecting many specimens of the prosaic, the humdrum, the inartistic. The same might be done to an equal—nay, I be-

lieve—even greater extent for Wordsworth. For Wordsworth, although a far loftier poet when at his best, was yet guilty, when uninspired, of floundering most hopelessly in the mire of the commonplace. Longfellow, although never attaining, even in his highest flights, to the upper levels of Wordsworth, never, on the other hand, sank so ignominiously and was so completely engulfed in the depths of banality.

Longfellow's poetry is essentially subjective; it is a transcript of the thoughts and emotions, the hopes and aspirations, the joys and sorrows of the man himself. This, then, is at once the secret of its strength and of its weakness. In Longfellow the poet was the flower and fruit of the man. The beauty and nobility of a singularly spotless character are reflected in his verse. So, too, of necessity, are his limitations. No one has ever claimed for him great intellectuality or Titanic force. He lacks also passion, and of humor there is only an occasional gleam.

"If we look in Longfellow's poetry," says Thomas Davidson, "for originality of thought, for profound psychological analysis, or for new insight into Nature, we shall be disappointed. Though very far from being hampered by any dogmatic philosophical or religious system of the past, his mind, until near the end, found sufficient satisfaction in the Christian view of life to make it indifferent to the restless, inquiring spirit of the present, and disinclined to play with any more recent solution of life's problems. He had no sympathy with either scepticism or formal dogmatism, and no need to hazard rash guesses respecting man's destiny. He was willing to say:

'I do not know; nor will I vainly question
Those pages of the mystic book which hold
The story still untold.
But without rash conjecture or suggestion
Turn its last leaves in reverence and good heed,
Until "The End" I read.'

Turning now to the poems for illustrations of his characteristic qualities, I shall choose, first of all, a few bits that have an especially personal or autobiographic value. At the

head of the list is entitled to stand the charming poem, "My Lost Youth," descriptive of his birthplace and boyhood's home—the stately city of Portland, beloved to-day of summer voyagers along the Maine coast.

Often I think of the beautiful town
That is seated by the sea;
Often in thought go up and down
The pleasant streets of that dear old town,
And my youth comes back to me.
And a verse of a Lapland song
Is haunting my memory still:
"A boy's will is the wind's will,
And the thoughts of youth are long, long thoughts."

I can see the shadowy lines of its trees,
And catch, in sudden gleams,
The sheen of the far-surrounding seas,
And islands that were the Hesperides
Of all my boyish dreams.
And the burden of that old song,
It murmurs and whispers still:
"A boy's will is the wind's will,
And the thoughts of youth are long, long thoughts."

.
And Deering's Woods are fresh and fair,
And with joy that is almost pain
My heart goes back to wander there,
And among the dreams of the days that were,
I find my lost youth again.
And the strange and beautiful song,
The graves are repeating it still:
"A boy's will is the wind's will,
And the thoughts of youth are long, long thoughts."

The "Sonnet on Parker Cleaveland," written on revisiting Brunswick in the summer of 1875, is a reminiscence of his undergraduate days at Bowdoin College.

Among the many lives that I have known,
None I remember more serene and sweet,
More rounded in itself and more complete,
Than his, who lies beneath this funeral stone.
These pines, that murmur in low monotone,
These walks frequented by scholastic feet,
Were all his world; but in this calm retreat
For him the Teacher's chair became a throne.

With fond affection memory loves to dwell
 On the old days, when his example made
 A pastime of the toil of tongue and pen;
 And now, amid the groves he loved so well
 That naught could lure him from their grateful shade,
 He sleeps, but wakes elsewhere, for God hath said, Amen!

In the *Voices of the Night*, Longfellow's first published volume of poems, occur some beautiful passages, full of the "sadness and longing" of the old-world singers, a quality infused, doubtless, during the young poet's three years' residence abroad. Note these strains:

I heard the trailing garments of the night
 Sweep through her marble halls!
 I saw her sable skirts all fringed with light
 From the celestial walls!

And, again, in "Footsteps of Angels," this touching reference to the young wife who so untimely left him:

the Being Beauteous,
 Who unto my youth was given,
 More than all things else to love me,
 And is now a saint in heaven.

With a slow and noiseless footstep
 Comes that messenger divine,
 Takes the vacant chair beside me,
 Lays her gentle hand in mine.

And she sits and gazes at me,
 With those deep and tender eyes,
 Like the stars, so still and saint-like,
 Looking downward from the skies.

Uttered not, yet comprehended,
 Is the spirit's voiceless prayer,
 Soft rebukes in blessings ended.
 Breathing from her lips of air.

During the period between the publication of *Voices of the Night* and *Evangeline* Longfellow wrote his most popular ballads and lyrics. His second volume, *Ballads and other Poems*, which gave him his true place in the poetic world, contained such favorites as "The Skeleton in Armor," "The Wreck of the Hesperus," "The Village Blacksmith," "The

Bridge," "The Rainy Day," and "Maidenhood;" while *The Belfry of Bruges and other Poems*, published four years later, added to these "The Day is Done," "The Old Clock on the Stairs," and "The Arrow and the Song."

As a ballad writer Longfellow has had few superiors among American poets. The ballad is a most exacting and difficult form. It must tell a simple tale simply. It must be short, concise, rapid, and every word must count. "The Wreck of the Hesperus" and "The Skeleton in Armor" meet these requirements. The latter is full of the old Norse spirit, imbibed by Longfellow through his knowledge of Scandinavian literature. For example:

Far in the Northern land,
By the wild Baltic's strand,
I with my childish hand,
Tamed the gerfalcon;
And with my skates fast-bound,
Skimmed the half-frozen Sound,
That the poor whimpering hound,
Trembled to walk on.

Oft to his frozen lair
Tracked I the grisly bear,
While from my path the hare
Fled like a shadow;
Oft through the forest dark
Followed the were-wolf's bark,
Until the soaring lark
Sang from the meadow.

And again:

Many a wassail-bout
Wore the long winter out;
Often our midnight shout
Set the cocks crowing,
As we the Berserk's tale
Measured in cups of ale,
Draining the oaken pail,
Filled to o'erflowing.

And best of all:

As with his wings aslant,
Sails the fierce cormorant,
Seeking some rocky haunt,
With his prey laden,

So toward the open main,
Beating to sea again,
Through the wild hurricane,
Bore I the maiden.

On December 17, 1839, Longfellow read reports of shipwrecks in the papers, and of bodies washed ashore near Gloucester—one lashed to a piece of wreckage. In his journal he wrote: "There is a reef called 'Norman's Woe' where many of these took place; among others the schooner *Hesperus*. I must write a ballad upon this." "A fortnight later," Colonel Higginson tells us, "he sat by his fire smoking, when suddenly it came into his mind to write the ballad of the schooner *Hesperus*, which, he says, I accordingly did. Then I went to bed, but could not sleep. New thoughts were running in my mind, and I got up to add them to the ballad. It was three by the clock. I then went to bed and fell asleep. I feel pleased with the ballad. It hardly cost me an effort. It did not come into my mind by lines, but by stanzas."

And well may he have felt pleased with this lovely ballad! Its lines have the true ring.

It was the schooner *Hesperus*,
That sailed the wintry sea;
And the skipper had taken his little daughter,
To bear him company.

What could be more simple and natural, by way of introduction? And then:

Blue were her eyes as the fairy-flax,
Her cheeks like the dawn of day,
And her bosom white as the hawthorn buds.
That ope in the month of May.

No one but a poet, inspired for the nonce, could have given us such a portrait. Many of the later lines, too, have a haunting melody about them—that quality of "inevitableness" that is the supreme test of true work:

And fast through the midnight dark and drear,
Through the whistling sleet and snow,
Like a sheeted ghost the vessel swept
Tow'rd the Reef of Norman's Woe.

And ever the fitful gusts between
A sound came from the land;
It was the sound of the trampling surf
On the rocks and the hard sea-sand.

She struck where the white and fleecy waves
Looked soft as carded wool,
But the cruel rocks, they gored her side
Like the horns of an angry bull.

In the opinion of many critics, particularly in America, the master-work of Longfellow, and the one that will carry his name down to posterity, is "Evangeline, a Tale of Acadie." Stedman calls it "the flower of American idyls," and Howells, "the best poem of our age." The particular incident here employed to such good purpose was, as we all know, first suggested to Longfellow by Hawthorne, in whose *American Note Books* occurs this entry: "H. L. C. heard from a French Canadian a story of a young couple in Acadie. On their marriage-day all the men of the province were summoned to assemble in the church to hear a proclamation. When assembled they were all seized and shipped off to be distributed through New England—among them the new bridegroom. His bride set off in search of him, wandered about New England all her lifetime, and at last, when she was old, she found her bridegroom on his death-bed. The shock was so great that it killed her likewise." "H. L. C." has been identified with the Rev. H. L. Connolly, a friend of Hawthorne's, who, we are told, was much disappointed because the great romancer failed to appropriate the story himself.

Longfellow used for this poem a metre which had been seldom employed in English literature—the old hexameter of Homer and Virgil. It seems to be the general opinion of metrical experts that this classic measure cannot be satisfactorily reproduced in English. Our language is too harsh and unbending. The quantity of English syllables depends, moreover, upon accent, and is not unchangeable, as in Greek. In Longfellow's hexameters there is, in consequence, much to criticise. He sometimes wrenches words too violently to force

them to his use; he has many faulty lines that are hardly even good prose.

Children's children sat on his knee and heard his great watch tick has been quoted as the worst hexameter line in the whole of English literature. Here is another, taken at random from "The Courtship of Miles Standish," than which it would be difficult to conceive anything more bald or utterly prosaic:

and the Commentaries of Caesar
Out of the Latin translated by Arthur Goldinge of London.

There is, too, about this metre a fatal facility that is very apt to make the poem written in it monotonous, "sounding," as one critic has put it, "like hoof beats on a muddy road."

Nevertheless, all must feel that to change the metre of "Evangeline" would be to rob it of much of its beauty. Of it Dr. Holmes has said: "From the first line of the poem, from its first words, we read as we would float down a broad and placid river, murmuring softly against its banks, heaven over it, and the glory of the unspoiled wilderness all around." "This is the forest primeval" has become as familiar, he thinks, as the *Arma virumque cano* of the *Æneid*. The lines descriptive of the burning of Grand Pre, beginning: "Suddenly arose from the South," while far from perfect as to their metre, are nevertheless almost Homeric in their grandeur.

"It was a striking illustration of the wide popularity of 'Evangeline,'" writes Colonel Higginson, "that even the proper names introduced under guidance of his (Longfellow's) rhythmical ear, spread to other countries, and were taken up and preserved as treasures in themselves. Sumner writes from England to Longfellow that the Hon. Mrs. Norton, herself well known in literature, had read 'Evangeline' not once only, but twenty times, and the scene on Lake Atchafalaya, where the two lovers pass each other unknowingly, so impressed her that she had a seal cut with the name upon it. Not long after this, Leopold, King of the Belgians, repeated the same word to her and said that it was so suggestive of

scenes in human life that he was about to have it cut in a seal, when she astonished him by showing him hers."

In 1854 Longfellow resigned, after eighteen years of service, his professorship at Harvard. In the following year he gave to the world the Indian Edda (to use his own term), "The Song of Hiawatha," a conscious imitation, both in subject and in metre, of the Finnish epic, the *Kalevala*, with which he had become acquainted during his second visit to Europe. Of the poet's longer works, this seems to be the favorite among foreign, particularly English, critics. Of it Richard Holt Hutton, writing in 1882, says: "To my mind 'Hiawatha' is by far the most original of his (Longfellow's) poems; because the happy Nature myths which best expressed the religious genius of the American Indians, appealed to what was deepest in himself, and found an exquisitely simple and harmonious utterance in the liquid accents of his child-like and yet not unstatelike verse." This, our nearest approach to an American epic, has certainly caught, as no other poem has, the spirit of the forest, the mythology of a fast-vanishing race:

the legends and traditions.
With the odors of the forest,
With the dew and damp of meadows,
With the curling smoke of wigwams,
With the rushing of great rivers.

The metre is indeed monotonous and easily ridiculed; but, like the measure of "Evangeline," it seems admirably suited to the theme. Perhaps the best single encomium on this poem came from Bayard Taylor, who, in a personal letter to the author, wrote: "The whole poem floats in an atmosphere of the American Indian Summer."

Of the twenty-two parts or cantos of this long work, the following may be named as possessing special interest and charm: III, Hiawatha's Childhood; VII, Hiawatha's Sailing, which embodies in literature the fast-vanishing birch-bark canoe; X, Hiawatha's Wooing; XII, Blessing the Cornfields; XV, Hiawatha's Lamentation; XX, The Famine.

In "The Courtship of Miles Standish" Longfellow has given us a charming picture of early Puritan life. He wrote it with great ease, we are told, between December, 1857, and March, 1858, and perhaps never composed anything with a lighter touch or more unmingled pleasure. The fact that he was himself descended, on the maternal side, from John Alden and Priscilla, the Puritan maiden, accounts, to some extent at least, for this singularly felicitous treatment. The poem was immediately popular. Twenty-five thousand copies were sold or ordered of the publishers during the first week, and ten thousand copies in London on the first day.

Longfellow returned in this poem to the classic hexameter; but the measure here is a shade more flexible than that of "Evangeline," and therefore lends itself better to reading. It is a noble poem, rich in sentiment and abounding in beautiful passages—from the first intimations of love to the exquisite lines at the close, descriptive of the wedding-day. When Priscilla declares,

for it is the fate of a woman
Long to be patient and silent, to wait like a ghost that is speechless,
Till some questioning voice dissolves the spell of its silence.
Hence is the inner life of so many suffering women,
Sunless and silent and deep, like subterranean rivers,
Running through caverns of darkness, unheard, unseen, and unfruitful,
Chafing their channels of stone, with endless and profitless murmurs,

one feels that the long-suppressed emotion of a woman's heart could not find more fitting utterance. In "The Sailing of the Mayflower" (Part V) occurs a touch of grim humor, extremely rare in our poet, where the ship-master

in haste shoved off to his vessel,
Glad in his heart to get rid of all this worry and flurry,
Glad to be gone from a land of sand and sickness and sorrow,
Short allowance of victual, and plenty of nothing but Gospel!

In "The Theologian's Tale of Elizabeth" (*Tales of a Wayside Inn*) Longfellow has portrayed with a delicate, sympathetic touch, the love of the Quaker maiden, Elizabeth Haddon. The scene here is laid on the banks of our own Delaware. It forms an interesting parallel study to the tale of John Alden

and Priscilla, laid in the woods and along the sandy shores of Cape Cod. What could be more naïve, for example, than Elizabeth's declaration of love?

Then Elizabeth said, though still with a certain reluctance,
As if impelled to reveal a secret she fain would have guarded:
I will no longer conceal what is laid upon me to tell thee;
I have received from the Lord a charge to love thee, John Estaugh.

Compare this with Priscilla's ingenuous "Why don't you speak for yourself, John?" And then the young Quaker's frank reply:

And John Estaugh made answer, surprised by the words she had spoken,
"Pleasant to me are they converse, thy ways, thy meekness of spirit;
Pleasant thy frankness of speech, and thy soul's immaculate whiteness,
Love without dissimulation, a holy and inward adorning.
But I have yet no light to lead me, no voice to direct me.
When the Lord's work is done, and the toil and labor completed
He hath appointed to me, I will gather into the stillness
Of my own heart awhile, and listen and wait for his guidance."

But the maiden's spirit, tried and refined in the fire of religious discipline, is undismayed by this cold rebuff.

Then Elizabeth said, not troubled nor wounded in spirit,
So is it best, John Estaugh. We will not speak of it further.
It hath been laid upon me to tell thee this, for to-morrow
Thou art going away, across the sea, and I know not
When I shall see thee more; but if the Lord hath decreed it,
Thou wilt return again to seek me here and to find me.
And they rode onward in silence, and entered the town with the others.

Other fine poems that immortalize incidents of early American history are: "Paul Revere's Ride"—the most spirited ballad inspired by the Revolution; "The Baron of St. Castine"; "The Rhyme of Sir Christopher"; "Eliot's Oak," and "Lady Wentworth"—the latter, a particularly animated portrait of one of our Colonial Dames!

As the poet of the American fireside Longfellow may be equalled, if not surpassed, by Whittier; but as the poet of our Northern ocean he is certainly unrivalled. "The Building of the Ship" is a poem very generally commended. To me some of the shorter and more modest poems, such as "Sea-

weed," "The Lighthouse," and "The Fire of Driftwood," are far more satisfying. They are steeped, as it were, in the brine, redolent of the vast, wind-blown spaces of the deep. One sleepless night he jots down in his diary: "Nahant, September 8, 1880, four o'clock in the morning," and then commits his thought to verse:

Four by the clock! and yet not day;
But the great world rolls and wheels away,
With its cities on land and its ships at sea,
Into the dawn that is to be!

Only the lamp in the anchored bark
Sends its glimmer across the dark,
And the heavy breathing of the sea
Is the only sound that comes to me.

"When reading these lines," declares Paul Elmer More, "it is easy to understand why Kipling reckoned Longfellow among the few poets who really knew the sea. No one who has spent much of his time on our Atlantic coast can fail to be struck by the magic evocation of that second stanza—the night-bound shore, the single light low on the water, the sleepy wash of the waves."

Of Longfellow as a translator I do not feel competent to speak. Foreign critics, notably those of England, do not hesitate to affirm that in his metrical renderings from the Italian and Spanish his greatest gifts appear. As an original and representative poet they consider him to be outranked by Poe and Whitman; but, as a translator, say they, he is without a peer. This, surely, is no mean praise. By it great and very special gifts are implied—very real poetic gifts, that give a man high and most honorable rank. Certainly the translation of Dante's *Divina Commedia* is a *magnum opus* that ranks with the great translations of the nineteenth century. In it he was assisted by Lowell and other scholars, and the finished work is considered a masterpiece of sympathetic no less than of faithful rendering.

Let us turn now, in closing, to a few of the poet's more tender and intimate outpourings—effusions that reveal most

fully the warmth and richness of his singularly lovable nature.

In the poem, "Resignation," written after the death of a little daughter, occur the familiar lines:

There is no flock, however watched and tended,
But one dead lamb is there!
There is no fireside, howsoever defended,
But has one vacant chair!

The air is full of farewells to the dying,
And mournings for the dead;
The heart of Rachel, for her children crying,
Will not be comforted!

And then, the summing up at the end:

And though at times impetuous with emotion
And anguish long suppressed,
The swelling heart heaves moaning like the ocean,
That cannot be at rest,—

We will be patient, and assuage the feeling
We may not wholly stay;
By silence sanctifying, not concealing,
The grief that must have way.

In "The Children's Hour" we are vouchsafed an enchanting glimpse into the home life of the widowed poet.

Between the dark and the daylight,
When the night is beginning to lower,
Comes a pause in the day's occupations,
That is known as the Children's Hour.

I hear in the chamber above me
The patter of little feet,
The sound of a door that is opened,
And voices soft and sweet.

From my study I see in the lamplight,
Descending the broad hall stair,
Grave Alice, and laughing Allegra,
And Edith with golden hair.

Do you think, O blue eyed banditti,
Because you have scaled the wall,
Such an old mustache as I am
Is not a match for you all!

I have you fast in my fortress,
 And will not let you depart,
 But put you down into the dungeon
 In the round-tower of my heart.
 And there will I keep you forever,
 Yes, forever and a day,
 Till the walls shall crumble to ruin,
 And moulder in dust away.

Among the Sonnets scattered through his works are some of the finest things Longfellow ever wrote. Here may be found those six magnificent sonnets prefixed to the translation of Dante, together with those on Shakspeare and Chaucer and Milton. Here, too, is his single love-poem, the sonnet to "My morning and my evening star of love." In the sonnets to "Three Friends of Mine" the long and devoted friendships of his life find expression. The three friends so enshrined were Cornelius Felton, Louis Agassiz and Charles Sumner, whom he calls

the noble three,
 Who half my life were more than friends to me.

The loss of Agassiz was a blow from which, it is said, he never entirely recovered; and when Sumner also left him he wrote:

Thou hast but taken thy lamp and gone to bed;
 I stay a little longer, as one stays
 To cover up the embers that still burn.

Again, in speaking of the three, he says:

I also wait, but they will come no more,
 Those friends of mine, whose presence satisfied
 The thirst and hunger of my heart. Ah me!
 They have forgotten the pathway to my door!
 Something is gone from nature since they died,
 And summer is not summer, nor can be.

Finally, among a small collection of "Personal Poems" must be named "Memories," "My Books"—the scholar-poet's farewell to the

ornaments and arms of other days,
 Not wholly useless, though no longer used.

and the remarkably suggestive *L'Envoi* entitled "Possibilities," probably the last sonnet Longfellow wrote:

Where are the Poets, unto whom belong
The Olympian heights; whose singing shafts were sent
Straight to the mark, and not from bows half bent,
But with the utmost tension of the thong?
Where are the stately argosies of song,
Whose rushing keels made music as they went
Sailing in search of some new continent,
With all sails set, and steady winds and strong?
Perhaps there lives some dreamy boy, untaught
In schools, some graduate of the field or street,
Who shall become a master of the art,
An admiral sailing the high seas of thought,
Fearless and first, and steering with his fleet
For lands not yet laid down in any chart.

The "Morituri Salutamus," written for the fiftieth anniversary of the class of 1825 (his own class) in Bowdoin College, is a noble poem, great in conception and almost flawless in execution. It contains many fine passages which I should like to quote; but an embarrassment of riches forbids that I should do more than sound the keynote of the opening lines and echo the beautiful sentiment of the close.

"O Cæsar, we who are about to die
Salute you!" was the gladiators' cry
In the arena, standing face to face
With death and with the Roman populace.

O ye familiar scenes,—ye groves of pine,
That once were mine, and are no longer mine,—
Thou river, widening through the meadows green
To the vast sea, so near and yet unseen,—
Ye halls, in whose seclusion and repose
Phantoms of fame, like exhalations, rose
And vanished,—we who are about to die
Salute you!

What then? Shall we sit idly down and say
The night hath come; it is no longer day?
The night hath not yet come; we are not quite
Cut off from labor by the falling light;
Something remains for us to do or dare;
Even the oldest tree some fruit may bear;
Not *Œdipus Coloneus*, or Greek Ode,
Or tales of pilgrims that one morning rode
Out of the gateway of the Tabard Inn,
But other something, would we but begin;

For age is opportunity no less
Than youth itself, though in another dress,
And as the evening twilight fades away
The sky is filled with stars, invisible by day.

Last of all, I shall venture to give that exquisitely tender sonnet, unpublished during the poet's life, kept, it would seem, like a dedicated thing, too sacred to be exposed to the profane gaze of the world. On July 10, 1861, the second Mrs. Longfellow met the tragic death, so often described, from injuries received by fire the day before. After the surviving husband's death, in March, 1882, his portfolio, being opened, revealed this poem, dated July 10, 1879 (the eighteenth anniversary, it will be noted, of the fateful day). It is entitled "The Cross of Snow," and is printed by Prof. Eliot Norton in his recently issued memorial volume.*

In the long, sleepless watches of the night,
A gentle face—the face of one long dead—
Looks at me from the wall, where round its head
The night-lamp casts a halo of pale light.
Here in this room she died; a soul more white
Never through martyrdom of fire was led
To its repose; nor can in books be read
The legend of a life more benedict.
There is a mountain in the distant West
That, sun-defying, in its deep ravines
Displays a cross of snow upon its side.
Such is the cross I wear upon my breast
These eighteen years, through all the changing scenes
And seasons, changeless since the day she died.

After all, then, is not Longfellow the poet of the people simply because he is so essentially and so vitally the poet of the affections, of the heart? We would not seek to number him—as he, the modest, the discerning, the self-appreciative, hoped not himself to be numbered —among "the grand old masters," among "the bards sublime,"

* Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. *A Sketch of his Life.* By Charles Eliot Norton. Together with Longfellow's Chief Autobiographical Poems. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

Whose distant footsteps echo
Through the corridors of Time.

For, like strains of martial music,
Their mighty thought suggest
Life's endless toil and endeavor.

Rather is he—rather would he himself have chosen to be
thought—one of those “humbler poets,”

Whose songs gushed from his heart,
As showers from the clouds of summer,
Or tears from the eyelids start.

For

Such songs have the power to quiet
The restless pulse of care,
And come like the benediction
That follows after prayer.

To write such songs was his gift; to “make a purer faith
and manhood shine in the untutored heart” was his consistent
aim; to have won the appreciation, affection and love of untold
thousands of his fellowmen has been his exceeding great
reward.

IV.

THE SOCIETY FOR PSYCHICAL RESEARCH AND IMMORTALITY.

BY THE REV. JOHN H. PRUGH, D.D.

This earthly life has so much of beauty in it, and it affords so many opportunities to love and serve and grow, that even if we knew there was no other life, this one would be well worth living.

"When I look upon the laughing face
Of children, or of woman's gentle grace;
Or when I grasp a true friend by the hand,
And feel a bond I partly understand;
When mountains thrill me, or when by the sea,
The plaintive waves rehearse their mystery;
Or when I watch the moon, with strange delight,
Treading her pathway amid the stars at night;
Or when the one I love, with kisses prest,
I clasp with bliss unspoken to my breast;
So strange, so deep, so wondrous life appears,
I have no words, but only happy tears.
I cannot think it all will end in nought;
That the abyss shall be the grave of thought,
That ever oblivion's shoreless sea shall roll
O'er love and wonder and the lifeless soul.
But even though this the end, I cannot say
I'm sorry I have seen the light of day—
So wondrous seems this life I live to me.
Whate'er the end, to-day I have and see;
To-day I think and hope; and so for this—
If this be all—for just so much of bliss,
Bliss blended through with pain, I bless the power
That holds me up to gaze one wondrous hour."

If this is all, earnest men want to know it; that they may make the most of it.

If this is only the beginning, earnest men hail every additional bit of knowledge that helps them know the fact, that

they may lay out their life on a scale proportioned to the magnificence of its possibilities.

The unknown that may become known has always been a field of exploration to the human mind. And psychical research holds out very alluring hopes to human interest. It has kept religious men searching for evidences of their most precious belief, and it has afforded to some sceptical men a refuge from despair.

Before this critical age belief in continued existence and some sort of communion between spirits and mortals was almost universal. Against this belief, in recent times, modern science has brought about a reaction. But science would surely go too far were it to label all the strange things reported, as not only not proven, but also asserting that they cannot be true.

The work of the Society for Psychical Research deeply interests us because its investigations concern a matter of such great importance. And we rejoice that these investigations are being scientifically made by men well qualified to make them.

The fact that so many persons uncritically accept the claims of spiritism and that so many persons are hungry for a belief which their reason forbids, led thoughtful men to feel that the truth, if possible, ought to be known. These men saw that either multitudes of people were deluded, and that it was worth while to help them out of their delusion, or that something was true which might comfort and help other multitudes who stood helpless and hopeless in the presence of the great mystery. It was out of such convictions that the movement for psychical research was born.

The prospectus of the society says:

"It has been widely felt that the present is an opportune time for making an organized and systematic attempt to investigate that large ground of debatable phenomena designated by such terms as 'mesmeric,' 'psychical,' 'spiritistic.' From the recorded testimony of many competent witnesses,

past and present, including observations recently made by scientific men of eminence in various countries, there appears to be, amid much delusion and deception, an important body of remarkable phenomena which are, *prima facie*, inexplicable on any generally recognized hypotheses, and which if, incontestably established, would be of the highest possible value."

The Society for Psychical Research has always been under the leadership of honorable men. Not the slightest taint of fraud has ever attached to it. And it has done invaluable service in exposing many frauds of charlatans.

The society may be said to have had its origin in the persistence of spiritualists in their claims. It was thought there might be a residuum of truth in these claims and to test the accuracy of this opinion the Society for Psychical Research was organized in 1882, with headquarters in London. The American Branch of the Society was formed, with headquarters in Boston, in 1884.

The society recognizes as a fact the existence, from all time, of a huge sum of inexplicable phenomena; it also recognizes this other fact, an intelligent human will; and it is endeavoring to discover if an equation exists between these two facts; and whether the mystery that has mastered so many centuries may not in turn be mastered. Other secrets of force have been conquered, may not this one be? Other laws have eluded, and at last been grasped. May it not be so with this?

It looks as though we were standing at the gate of an unknown law, or series of laws. To know that the unknown exists, is a step gained. To concede that there is something to conquer is a prophecy of coming victory.

If, in the nineteenth century an ether wave came to be understood and managed, possibly, in the twentieth century, a brain wave, also, will be understood and managed. What benefactors they will be if men will discern in this mystery, old as the human race, the substance of a verified law.

It is asserted that the greatest discovery of the nineteenth

century was that of the evolution of the race. It will be a greater discovery, if somebody, in this century, explains the dissolution of the race.

It is even more important to know where we go to, than to know where we come from. From the origin of man to the destiny of man seems to be the natural step.

While science has been content to deal with the past, allowing faith to give us a future, we must not forget that human love is one of the great forces of human nature. And earth-bound human knowledge is ever lifting its eyes to the firmament of immortal life.

If some other term than "spiritism" were used, if the evidence for survival after death could be spoken of without awakening any suspicion of associations connected with so much fraud and illusion as have haunted the path of charlatan adventurers and their innocent dupes, many phenomena might have received the careful attention of the thinking world, even though the phenomena were not considered as furnishing proof of immortality.

Until within very recent years the experience of scientific men with this doctrine and its adherents made it very hard for sane men to meddle with its claims.

Religion, in spite of its quarrel with science on other matters, has accepted its verdict on this question, or relying on its doctrine of a revelation for the fact of survival, has been content with the denial of any communications between the two worlds.

Another circumstance that has discredited "spiritism" is, that most of the phenomena that are classified as spiritistic have no relevancy, *evidentially*, at least, to the real issue. Only a very small number of its alleged data has any bearing upon the problem of immortality. One kind of phenomena, only, are allowed as evidence of immortality, in the appeal to independent existence, for the explanation of exceptional events. This is that class of occurrences which betray evidence of continued personality after death. All the rest are no more related to the problem than fairy stories.

Most of the alleged phenomena of spiritualism afford not the slightest evidence for a spirit even if these phenomena are genuine. The most that they illustrate or prove is the existence of a new physical force, or some new range of mental and physiological functions, assuming them genuine. They do not meet, in any respect, the requirements of proof for disincarnate spirits.

The very first duty, therefore, of the Society for Psychical Research, as an investigator, was to classify the alleged phenomena with reference to their pertinence to the issue, *evidentially*, and the society did this without regard to any possible result, respecting spiritism. In the beginning, the primary object of the society was not to prove any theory nor to disprove it, but to investigate the authenticity and credibility of certain alleged facts.

Those coincidences which represented common thoughts at various distances and under circumstances which precluded both ordinary sense-perception and suggestion, were assigned to "telepathy" or "thought-transference." This denomination of a fact does not imply any conception of its *modus operandi*. It is only a name for the necessity of recognizing a causal connection between two events, and the presumption in favor of its being a direct process between two living minds comes from the fact that there are many instances of it, not *evidential* of anything else than this casual nexus, and that the scientific law of parsimony does not permit the interference to be ascribed to the *transcendental*, until the incidents and the knowledge involved *necessitate* this conclusion. Consequently telepathy is only a name for a "causal nexus" in which the ordinary channels of sense impression cannot be assumed. The alleged supernormal acquisition of knowledge of physical events or objects outside the range of both ordinary sense-impressions and telepathy is called "*Clairvoyance*." Whether any such power exists as a fact is neither assumed nor proved by this conception or definition.

"Second-sight" was called by the society "premonition";

"ghosts" were called "apparitions," in order to affiliate them with "illusions" and "hallucinations," with the necessary reservations for cases having a more important significance. And, alleged supernormal movements of physical objects were called "telekinesis." "Mediumistic" phenomena occupied a separate place, but were given no other technical name. But among all these, only a certain type of apparitions, and as distinct a type of mediumistic phenomena, can lay the slightest claim to being spiritistic in their evidential character, or perhaps in any other character. The question of immortality is not in the least concerned with any of them, except, conditionally, with a very limited class of them apparently affording testimony of personal identity.

Another thing that limits the evidence for immortality is competency to deal with the phenomena as well as honesty in observing them. No phenomena can have any evidential value, for any purpose whatsoever, without a definite knowledge of the conditions that will assure their genuineness and significance. Scientific men draw an important distinction between what may be a fact, so far as our knowledge goes, and what can be proved as a fact. Only that which will accomplish the latter can have evidential value in dealing with the problem of immortality.

And another limitation to evidence for survival after death comes from the fact that phenomena purporting to be spiritistic must represent facts that involve the unity of consciousness and personal identity which we once knew and can verify among the living. The soul, if there be such a thing, might survive with a complete loss of personal identity, but if this were the case there would be no way of proving immortality in any form which would satisfy the human race. We have no ground to assume even the existence of a soul—that is a subject other than the brain—until we have isolated it in its activity. The problem of the existence and the survival of a soul go together.

Consequently the only positive assurance that we can ever

have of the existence of a soul depends upon the proof of its survival, and this depends upon the retention of a sense of personal identity, with the additional fact, that communication is possible.

During its first years, the Society for Psychical Research occupied itself with the whole field of these phenomena without favor to any supposition except telepathy, and it offered no data for proving immortality, though many of its phenomena lent very great plausibility to that supposition. The most that its members would admit was the fact of transmission of ideas from mind to mind without ordinary mediation of sense-impressions.

But this thought-transference, or telepathy, has this peculiarity, on the one hand it limits the acquisition of evidence for immortality, as long as we can assume thought-transference between incarnate minds as sufficient to account for any given phenomena, and on the other hand to render communication between a spiritual and a material existence possible, supposing a spiritual existence possible also. For if thought can, in anyway, be transmitted from mind to mind without the mediation of sense impressions, a transcendental consciousness, a spirit, if it exists, might give evidence of its survival and personal identity, assuming the possibility of any conditions whatsoever favoring it. Therefore, it becomes only a matter of the quality and quantity of this evidence that is obtainable. Twenty years ago Professor James, of Harvard University, president of the American branch of the Society for Psychical Research, and Dr. Richard Hodgson, an Englishman, undertook the investigation of a lady who seemed to possess remarkable supernatural powers, which took the dramatic form of spirit communications. Several volumes of the society's reports deal with this case of Mrs. Piper alone.

While the first two volumes of the report did not commit the investigators to any thing more than telepathy, in spite of the difficulties which this hypothesis encountered in many

instances, the third volume expressed the positive conviction of Dr. Hodgson, who had become the secretary of the American branch of the society, that the spiritistic theory was more preferable than telepathy. The fourteenth volume of the society's reports, which contains an account of Professor James H. Hyslop's experiments, expresses his conviction, also, that the spiritistic theory is preferable to that of telepathy.

I had a summer evening with my classmate, Professor Hyslop, while he was connected with Columbia University. We spent the hours talking about his investigations, until Dr. Hodgson came in to go over, with the professor, the proofs of the forthcoming volume of the society's reports. In that conversation, and in a subsequent correspondence, as well as in what he has published, Dr. Hyslop stated that there were five alternative hypotheses which can be entertained in the explanation of the phenomena obtained in the investigation of the alleged mediumship of Mrs. Piper. They are fraud, illusion, suggestion, telepathy, or spiritism. Some have suggested that the devil is a sixth alternative theory. But this assumes some form of spirit existence, which is the thing to be proved. The hypothesis of fraud assumes four forms: (a) Conscious fraud by the medium, in the employment of a detective system, a well-known method of acquiring information for the deception of the innocent in some cases; (b) conscious fraud by the medium at the sittings in the various ways by which it is possible, such as "fishing," and questions; (c) unconscious fraud on the part of the secondary personality of the medium, involving self-deception and pretensions subliminally acquired, as M. Flornoy, in his intensely interesting book, "From India to the Planet Mars," has proven to be the case with the Miss Smith, of France, whom he investigated; (d) there might be fraud, conscious fraud, by the sitters and experimenters. No serious attention to either telepathy or spiritism can be given, until fraud, illusion, and suggestion have been eliminated. And in the case of Mrs. Piper, nobody who took part in the investi-

gations believes there was the slightest taint of fraud. And whoever reads the published reports of the society comes to the same conclusion.

Professor James says: "The hypothesis of fraud can not be seriously entertained. The medium has been under observation for fifteen years, much of the time under close observation, as to most of the conditions of her life, by a large number of persons, eager, many of them, to pounce upon any suspicious circumstances. But during all this time not only has there not been one single suspicious circumstance remarked, but not one suggestion has even been made from any quarter which might tend positively to explain how the medium, living the life she leads, could possibly collect information about so many sitters by natural means. The scientist who is conscious of fraud here must remember that in science, as much as in common life, an hypothesis must receive some positive specification and determination before it can be profitably dismissed. And a fraud, that is no assigned kind of fraud, but simply fraud at large, can hardly be regarded as a specially, scientific explanation of specific concrete acts. There is no sign whatever that Mrs. Piper, when awake, has any curiosity about persons, least at all, about persons whom she has never met."

At the request of Professor James, Dr. Hodgson came from England, with the avowed purpose of exposing Mrs. Piper as he had previously proved Madam Blavatsky a humbug. *He lived to believe, and put on record, his belief, that through Mrs. Piper he COMMUNICATED WITH DEPARTED FRIENDS.*

Dr. Hyslop declares there is no question about the genuineness of Mrs. Piper's trance, and that there is, then, absolutely no resource for fraud, of any sort, except that of unconscious fraud. But no one can closely read the reports without discovering that it accounts for nothing, without assuming telepathy in combination with it, and, this once supposed, the whole possibility of the supernormal is admitted. Finding that he had to dismiss both conscious and unconscious fraud

from his judgment of the phenomena, Professor Hyslop felt that, possibly, the evidence for the spiritistic theory might still be largely weakened by suggestions from the sitters. Therefore, he arranged for sittings himself which he conducted under conditions that completely excluded illusions and suggestions on his part, and fraud on the part of Mrs. Piper. The details of his investigation are in the fourteenth volume of the Reports of the Psychical Research Society. All who know Professor Hyslop know him to be a keen and thorough scholar, a painstaking investigator and an altogether honorable man. And as a result of his investigations he says, he is reduced to a choice between telepathy and the spiritistic theory to explain the Piper phenomena, and for the present, at least, he prefers the spiritistic view, the claim that the immortality of the soul has come within the sphere of legitimate scientific belief.

Mrs. Piper was under the control of the Society for Psychical Research for fifteen years. She did not give public sittings. Arrangements for the sittings were made through the American secretary, Dr. Hodgson. The sittings were in Mrs. Piper's library. There were no physical tappings at all or mechanical apparatus. Only a writing-pad and pencil were necessary, and these, the sitter, himself, furnished. Arrangements for sittings were made with her in her normal state. Then, when she was in the trance, the spirits that seem to be in control of her were addressed. She did not know, after recovery from the trance, what she had said or written and it was kept from her knowledge until published.

Most of the messages were written by Mrs. Piper's hand, while she was in a completely unconscious state, with her head resting on a pillow on a table. All questions and remarks addressed to the "communicators," or "spirits in control," were spoken slowly to the hand, and were recorded in their proper place, and chronological order, with the "messages" that were given back, so that a perfect record of everything that occurred was effected.

To conceal his identity Professor Hyslop wore a mask covering his entire face. He concealed his voice from Mrs. Piper, and never touched her during the seventeen sittings, so that identification and muscular suggestion were completely excluded.

The first "control" of Mrs. Piper, who claimed to be a discarnate spirit, declared he was a certain French physician—Dr. Phinuit Schiville. But he failed to prove his identity. Subsequently, a New York friend of Dr. Hodgson, with the nom de plume, "George Pelham," died. This man had promised Dr. Hodgson, if he died, to identify himself if possible. He did appear through Mrs. Piper and thoroughly convinced Dr. Hodgson and many other friends of his identity. In life "George Pelham" had been a lawyer, and had devoted himself, chiefly, to literature and philosophy, and had published two books which received the highest praise from competent authority. He was also an associate member of the Society for Psychical Research. But he did not believe in a future life. Yet, some time before his death, he promised Dr. Hodgson that if he should die first, he would, if he found himself still existing, afterward, make things lively in the effort to reveal his continued existence. Through Mrs. Piper he appeared to Dr. Hodgson and other friends, and by his complete and ready recognition of these friends, and his familiarity with the myriads of associations involved, and by never having recognized a person not formerly known to him, he succeeded in presenting a very strong case in favor of his being the person he represented himself to be in his communications.

This "George Pelham" and a little band of discarnate spirits represented themselves as endeavoring, through Mrs. Piper, to reveal a future life to man. Whether they can be accepted as being what they claim to be, depends upon the success of proving personal identity of some deceased person.

The mode of "communications" was somewhat as follows: Mrs. Piper went into a trance—some state of insensibility and

unconsciousness, of whose nature we know little or nothing; her head rested on a pillow placed upon a table. A pencil was placed in her fingers and the communications were written out on a pad. Many of the things written seem very trivial. But their value consists in that fact. The first problem for the psychical researcher is personal identity of the alleged discarnate spirit, and only the most trivial incidents imaginable can make that certain. Generalities, profound philosophy, poetic description and similar phenomena would only condemn all claims to spiritism.

I can not go into the details of Professor Hyslop's investigations. But the many communications alleged to have come to him from his father, through Mrs. Piper, were such as to lead him to believe that his father's identity was established, and that there is scientific foundation for believing in the immortality of the soul.

In Mrs. Piper's case the fraud theory is ruled out of court, and we must chose between telepathy and spiritism.

The telepathic theory has numerous difficulties, and the greatest one is that it makes the human mind all but omniscient. To shut off direct telepathy Professor Hyslop remained in New York and Dr. Hodgson had the sittings in Boston, five of them. All the facts revealed were unknown to Dr. Hodgson, and many of them were unknown to Professor Hyslop. He had to visit relatives in Ohio to verify them. To obtain such incidents telepathy would have first to hunt up the right person, among all living consciousness, this person being absolutely unknown to the medium, and from this person's memory select the right fact to personate the communicator. Who ever can believe that, ought not find it difficult to believe in spirits, as the latter is certainly not any larger in its demands upon credulity. And in all other scientific evidence for telepathy except the Piper case there is not trace of such a power as must be ascribed to it here, where all the criteria of personal identity are satisfied.

There is another important fact against the telepathic hypothesis. There are marked differences in regard to the clearness of the communications between different communications. The facts regarding our departed friends are subject to precisely the same mental conditions, in our memory, for all of them. And it is absurd that telepathy should be clear respecting one person, and uniformly confused respecting another. But, this is the case.

Dr. Hodgson found, in his experiments, that persons recently deceased, and especially suicides, were not good communicators. And Professor Hyslop's experiments also bear out this induction. An uncle, who died two months before the professor's first sitting, was indicated very clearly in two messages. And yet, though Professor Hyslop was very intimate with him, and had much in common with him in their intellectual experiences, this uncle never communicated with the professor once.

All this is absolutely incompatible with the telepathic hypothesis.

The discriminative power assumed in the acquisition of data already indicated, was not exercised in the case just mentioned, when on any telephatic theory the professor should have obtained abundant incidents. Besides, no one can conceive, on any known psychological law, why the memory of a sitter or distant living person, should be more difficult to penetrate in the case of incidents pertaining to recently deceased persons. Especially when emotional interest appears to be an aid to communications rather than a hindrance.

The only natural hypothesis, as illustrating the proper unity and known psychological laws, so Professor Hyslop believes, is the spiritistic. Members of the Society for Psychical Research looked upon Mrs. Piper as a sort of telephone or transmitter, and they expressed their belief that, as investigation proceeded the difficulties in the way of clearer communication would be gradually explained, or that they would be greatly diminished.

The statement of "communicators," who spoke through Mrs. Piper, as to what occurs on the physical side is that we all have bodies composed of "luminiferous ether" enclosed in our carnal bodies. The relation of Mrs. Piper's ethereal body to the ethereal world in which the "communicators" claim to dwell is such that a special store of peculiar energy is accumulated in connection with her organism, and this appeared to them as "light." Mrs. Piper's ethereal body was removed by them, and her ordinary body appeared as a shell filled with this light. Several "communicators," often, were in contact with this "light" at the same time. And three separate "communicators" or "spirits" have been known to carry on conversations through Mrs. Piper at the same time, one "communicator" using her voice, another her right hand and still another her left hand. Upon the brightness of this "light," in Mrs. Piper, the communications depend. When she was in ill health the "light" was feeble and the communications were less coherent.

As to the communications, "George Pelham" says: "You to us are more like we understand sleep to be. You look shut up as one in prison, and in order for us to get into communication with you we have to enter into your sphere, as one like yourself, asleep. This is just why we make mistakes, as you call them, or get confused and muddled, so to put it."

Dr. Hodgson declared Mrs. Piper's organism represented one end of a line, the other end of which is in the so-called spirit world. Or, if there is a recognizable possibility of this, it seems eminently desirable that we should try to find out what will improve the line and the transmitting and receiving apparatus, and if possible obtain knowledge concerning the methods to be used in making and improving other similar machines.

The whole question of psychical research has been so clouded by fraud on one side, and by sweeping prejudice on the other, that it is interesting to read what some famous men have thought about it.

Long before the Society for Psychical Research was organized, Immanuel Kant, recognizing the need of such a society said:

"At some future day it will be proved, I can not say when and where, that the human soul is, while in life, already in an uninterrupted communication with those living in another world; that the human soul can act upon those beings, and receive, in return, impressions of them without being conscious of it in the ordinary personality. It would be a blessing if the state of things in the other world, and the conditions under which an interchange of the two worlds may take place—perceived by us in speculative manner—could not only be theoretically exhibited, but practically established by real and generally acknowledged facts, thus observed."

In 1885, during a conversation with the late F. W. H. Myers, Gladstone said, referring to the theory of communication between those in the seen and the unseen world: "*It is the most important work which is being done in the world—by far the most important.*"

Professor Wm. Crookes, inventor of the radiometer, and the constructor of the vacuum tubes by means of which X-rays have been obtained, the discoverer of the sodium amalgamation process for separating gold and silver from their ores, and who harnessed a sunbeam to a machine and made light itself guide a mill, whose vacuum tubes made possible the miracle of obtaining a perfect photograph of a man's spine while he was wearing his clothes and had not yet dispensed with his flesh, thirty-five years ago published, in the *Quarterly Journal of Science*, an article, setting forth his attitude as a scientific man, when confronted with the phenomena of spiritualism. He believed that the whole affair was a superstition, or at least, an unexplained trick. But, in 1874, in the same *Journal*, he embodied the chief results of his own inquiry, and staked his reputation upon a list of verified phenomena. And in 1894 he closed his address as president of the Psychical Research Society, by saying: "I venture to assert

that both in actual, careful record of new and important facts, and in suggestiveness, our society's work and publications will form no unworthy preface to a profounder science, both of man, of nature and of worlds not realized than this planet has yet known."

While the results of the work of the Society for Psychical Research have furnished new reasons for some men's believing in the immortality of the soul, the old reasons, on which the Christian faith has rested for more than nineteen centuries are still quite sufficient for most of us. But it illy becomes any one to sneer at those who present newer reasons which their scientific researches may seem to discover or suggest.

Communication with the dead is one of the oldest beliefs, and we are in hearty sympathy with the Society for Psychical Research, with the aims of those earnest men who, with more method than the earlier ages knew, are seeking to verify their faith.

To hold to the belief that in some way spirits of the dead communicate with the living, and to reach that conclusion not by faith, or philosophic deduction, but by rigid scientific proof, would, as has often been pointed out, be the instant death of materialistic philosophy, and it would be, at the same time, in the direct line with what the human heart craves and Christianity teaches.

Not a very large number of men, however, have yet reached such a conclusion. It may come. We thoroughly welcome the search for it. But, until it comes, the instinctive longing of the soul for its own immortality and the testimony of the Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, are the grounds of our belief.

PITTSBURG, PA.

V.

GHOSTS.

BY THE REV. D. B. LADY, D.D.

The word ghost is Anglo-Saxon. The original is *g-a-s-t*. The *h* is a modern and unnecessary insertion. At least, so the Century dictionary says; it means breath, spirit. The ghost is the incorporeal part of man. Giving up the ghost is one way of describing the act of dying. The word ghost is used more particularly, however, to designate the disembodied spirit.

"I thought that I had died in sleep
And was a blessed ghost."—COLERIDGE.

Human beings consist not only of bodies but of one or more finer substances of an immaterial character. There are those who speak of the tripartite nature of man. Others speak of man merely as material and spiritual, as body and soul. And this way of speaking will serve the purposes of this paper.

When death comes the soul leaves the body. The bodily organization lapses. All bodily operations cease. The blood no longer circulates. No messages are carried from brain to organs. Energy, power and life have left the body. It no longer moves from place to place. The carbon, oxygen, hydrogen and nitrogen of which it is composed, separate, and are dispersed in the water, earth and air, and may be taken up into other organizations. The body no longer exists as a body.

But do the spiritual elements, assuming that the soul is made up of different immaterial elements as the body is of material elements, also separate, and seek other alliances and enter into other organisms? Or does the spiritual part of man continue to exist after death as an intelligent, self-conscious, self-directing individuality, apart from the body?

Does the soul live on, disconnected from the body with which it was connected for years, after this connection has been broken? If it does, this is the ghost, with which the present paper is concerned. And the universe must be full of ghosts. Our departed ancestors are ghosts. In a very short time we who are now alive and in the body, having laid aside the curtain and veil of the flesh, will be ghosts. "What are we now but ghosts, walking about in flesh and skin!"

From very ancient times men have believed in the continuance of existence after death. This is evident from the fact that the dead were often left in their dwelling places and at other times special structures were made for them, and that their weapons, utensils and ornaments were frequently placed by their side when they were buried and that food was offered to them from time to time. In the Nile valley bodies were embalmed, so that the soul might still retain its earthly enshrinement. In India, the doctrine of Metempsychosis prevailed. But finally the thought of the indestructible soul going from one body to another eternally became a burden too heavy to be borne. Buddhism offered relief in the doctrine that transmigration ceased in *Nirvana*, eternal rest, when the soul was resumed into the cause whence it emanated, never to depart from it again.

Prof. J. P. Mahaffy, speaking of the tombs discovered by Schlieman at Mycenæ, the royal city of Agamemnon, and the treasures they contained, says: "The only meaning such precious offerings to the dead can have is to express the belief that there is some continued existence for the dead . . . that it was a cause of satisfaction to the dead to have their most precious property buried with them . . . the contents of Schlieman's tombs prove the belief in the existence of man after death."

As the centuries passed men became more and more conscious of a faith in a future life. The arguments of Socrates and Plato for the immortality of the soul are well known. And there are perhaps more persons in this age who hope for,

and look forward to, an existence beyond the grave than ever before.

If the soul exists after death apart from the body, the ghost, in other words, is it likely that it possesses the same vigor and power which it possessed in this life? This question has been answered both negatively and affirmatively.

There are those who believe the soul after death, the ghost, is less vigorous, less alive, than it was while in the body. They say, a bodily organization, in which the spirit abides and through which it operates, is a condition of its growth and full activity. Canvas and brush and paint are material things, but by means of them the artist develops and expresses his conception of beauty. Without these material things he would be very much handicapped. So the soul lives in, and expresses itself through the body and when the body is no more it may find its power and its activities very much circumscribed. Its existence may be much more incomplete when out of the body than when in the body. It may be a mere nebulous, shadowy existence, without real substance, without full life.

The ancients conceived of the existence of disembodied spirits as of this character. They spoke of them as shades, shadows of their former selves. Their life was cold and cheerless. There was no hearty energy in their activities, nor was there the enjoyment which comes from the possession and exercise of power. And probably most persons, at this day, without reasoning upon the subject, entertain very much the same conception of the ghost. We apply the word in this sense to other things, speaking of a ghost of a smile or a ghost of a chance, as though the ghost of a thing were but a faint reflection of the thing itself. Whether this impression is intuitive or whether it comes by education it is difficult to decide.

It is possible, however, that this is an erroneous opinion, however old and deeply rooted it may be. Whilst the body in this life is the material organ of the soul it may not be an

essential condition of its complete existence. The soul, no doubt, reaches a certain stage of growth while inhabiting the body, but that may be only in one period of its history, which ends with its separation from the body in death. A time may arrive in the soul's growth when the body becomes a hindrance rather than a help to its further development.

The chicken begins its life in the egg and grows there for a season in a perfectly normal way. But if, at a certain time, the shell does not break and the chick come forth, it perishes. It has exhausted its original environment for purposes of growth. Only by transcending and casting off its first investment can it come into its new environment of air and sunshine and food and exercise, and fulfill its appointed mission.

Something similar to this may be true also of the soul. Its connection with the body may, in the nature of the case, be only temporary. Death, though a crisis, involving suffering and separation from friends and a transition into an untried sphere of existence, may be a relief. Hindrances and limitations are removed from the soul at death. It finds freedom and enjoyment, such as it could not have while connected with the body. Its chains have fallen off. Its prison doors have been broken down. It is in the soul-world, in direct and immediate communion with other disembodied spirits, spiritual essences, and the Deity. It has come into a sphere where all its powers expand and where they can be exercised to a degree which was impossible while connected with the body.

The general growth of human life seems to indicate that this is the true view. In the child the body is uppermost. Eating and sleeping and afterward playing are almost the only things done by the child. But there is mind and a moral life. And these gradually assert themselves. But at first they perceive only what is addressed to them through the senses. There are spoken and written words and figures and formulas. It is difficult to make a beginning in education without these sensible images of truth and righteousness. But later on the mind and moral nature largely free themselves from outward

forms. Only the results of intellectual and spiritual processes come to written or spoken form. The soul is elevated into a sphere in which physical sensations play a very small part. The mind and the moral nature are in complete ascendancy. So that even in this life the soul at times transcends and is in a great degree independent of bodily limitations; and it comes into greater freedom than if it were limited to bodily forms. "The mind is the measure of the man," and not the body. And the more mind and moral nature become emancipated from the flesh the greater the man becomes.

May we not conclude from this that the spirit, or ghost, when separated from the body at death is not less alive and real, but much more so, than when connected with the body before death? Some one says: "We may regard the body as the prison-house of the soul, released from which it can spread its wings and soar unfettered into regions of pure and perfect life." If this means anything, it means that the soul out of the body can see more clearly, reason more consecutively, have a more correct conception of, and live in greater harmony with, what is just and true and come into more intimate communion with other souls and with the Deity than when in the body.

The question may here be raised whether our souls in this life, in other words, the embodied ghosts of men and women, can impress one another or communicate with one another without employing the ordinary physical means of communication?

When we study the history of the methods of interchanging ideas we see great progress. At first emotions found inarticulate expression. A smile denoted pleasure, a frown indicated the presence of pain. Then there were the elementary sounds of laughing and groaning. Such expressions were soon recognized by those present as making known what was passing in the soul of him who smiled or frowned. Laughing and groaning developed into articulate language of a simple character, and this, in course of time, became more complex.

Writing had a similar history. An increase in the intellectual matter and an abbreviation of the form of expression is the tendency. Communication between persons far apart also gradually became more and more emancipated from lumbering physical media. The public mail service long since took the place of the private messenger. The magnetic telegraph came in due time, and the telephone, and wireless telegraphy. The microscope and the telescope also came into use, adding wonderfully to the power of the eye to see what was before invisible. The effort is to overcome time and distance and to reduce the media of communication to the minimum.

But may the physical means of communication, as generally employed, under certain conditions be entirely dispensed with? Can mind communicate with mind without gestures, or words, or written messages, or the use of the telegraph or telephone? Is there a more subtle wireless telegraphy than that of Marconi, by which one soul can discover what is passing in another? This, of course, would be a long step in advance of the steps of progress in intercommunication just glanced at. It would be a difference in kind of an astonishing character. But the question is, is it impossible? Let us look at some well-known facts.

If, in a company of men and women, you think intensely of some one present, and perhaps gaze steadily in his direction, you will disturb him so that he will turn and look at you. An unsympathetic audience is harder to speak to than one that is in harmony with the orator. Even a single hostile hearer of strong personality will hinder the logical course of an argument and the easy flow of sentences. It is mind acting upon mind, psychic or ghostly communication independent of physical means of communication. The approach of a friend or even the coming of an event often turns a susceptible mind to him or it before they are seen or heard. "Name the dog and he appears." It is not naming the dog that causes him to approach, but his approach puts the thought of him into the mind and his name is uttered because he is coming. One sees

vividly in a sleeping or waking moment a railroad wreck, and some hours or days afterwards the wreck takes place in perfect duplication of the vision. A lost article appears to the loser in a dream in the midst of surroundings easily recognized the next morning when the property is readily recovered. The voice of a wounded soldier, on a battlefield, calling upon his wife and children, or of a shipwrecked sailor, uttering the name of his mother in an agony, is heard by these relatives, though they are a hundred or a thousand miles away from the scene of the disaster. Feeling and thought seem to have dynamic force, and make themselves felt immediately or through media of the nature of which we are ignorant or at which we can only guess. Mind, in a state of intense excitement acts upon another mind, attuned to be impressed—a spiritual or ghostly Marconi receiving instrument without using the accustomed means of communication or when the use of such means is impossible at the moment.

The Society for Psychical Research, a group of learned men in England and this country, including college presidents, authors, statesmen, journalists and eminent professional men, has investigated and pronounced reliable a number of accounts of instances of psychic communication between persons at a distance; and a few of these are given at this point.

“A commander in the British Navy, T. Aylesburg, of Sutton, Surrey, England, when a boy of thirteen years, was in a boat which was capsized whilst the crew were attempting to land on the island of Bally, east of Java. On coming to the surface he called for his mother. For this the sailors jeered him afterwards. Months later, at home, the boy told his mother of his narrow escape, and said: ‘While I was under water I saw you all sitting in this room, mother, Emily, Eliza and Ellen; you were working at something white.’ His mother at once said: ‘Why yes, and I heard you cry out for me, and sent Emily to look out of the window.’ Years afterwards, in reply to an inquiry, the sister, Emily, wrote him as follows: ‘I distinctly remember the incident you mention. I shall

never forget it. We were sitting quietly at work. We first heard a faint cry of mother. We all looked up and said: Did you hear that? The voice again called, mother, twice in quick succession, the last a frightened agonizing cry. Mother said to me, go to the door and see what is the matter. I ran directly into the street, but all was silent and not a person was to be seen. Mother was sadly upset about it. She wrote down the date the next day; and when you came home and told us how nearly you were drowned, and the time of day, father said it would be about the time nine o'clock would be with us. I know the date and the time corresponded.' "

"Miss Ella Stainthorp, of 1099 Lafayette Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y., had a brother, named William, aged forty-two years, with whom she resided, and another brother, named George, aged fifty years, who had gone to Texas, about two years before the events of this story, and from whom they had not heard for a long time, their letters to him being returned from the postoffice to which they were addressed. They feared that he had perished in the Galveston flood. Finally they decided to make one more effort to communicate with him and sent a registered letter, containing a money order, payable to him, and posted it to Houston, Texas, on the twenty-fifth day of February, 1903. That night William died suddenly in bed. The third night after this Miss Stainthorp and a friend, Miss Julia A. O'Brien, were sitting up as watchers of the corpse. Miss Stainthorp fell asleep but her friend kept awake. About three o'clock in the morning Miss O'Brien wakened her companion and said some one was calling her by the door. The voice came again, saying, 'Nell, Nell, letter!' Miss Stainthorp arose and said: 'Julia, that is the voice of George, and he has my letter.' Two days later they had a letter from George, saying he had received the letter early in the morning of the day on which his sister had heard his voice. In his letter George asked: 'Is anything the matter with Will?'"

The following is given by Mrs. Sidgwick, a sister of the

English Prime Minister, Balfour, in a paper read before the Society for Psychical Research: "Mr. S. R. Wilmot, on the fourth of October, 1863, sailed from Liverpool for New York in the steamer, *City of Limerick* of the Inman line. The second day out a severe storm began which lasted nine days. Upon the night following the eighth day it moderated and Mr. Wilmot was enjoying a refreshing sleep, the first on that voyage. Toward morning he dreamed that he saw his wife, who had been left in the United States, open the door into his stateroom, clad in her night clothes, hesitate at the door a moment, and then advancing, kiss and embrace him, and gently withdraw. Upon awakening in the morning, his room mate, whose berth was higher but not directly over his, was lying on his berth looking fixedly at him, and finally, smiling, said, 'you are a pretty fellow, to have a lady come and visit you in this way'; and when pressed for an explanation, he said that while lying awake in his berth, about three o'clock, he had seen what exactly corresponded to Mr. Wilmot's dream. This he repeated three different times during the rest of the voyage. The man was Wm. J. Tait, son of an English clergyman, and himself a librarian of Cleveland, O.

"When Mr. Wilmot met his wife, almost her first question was: 'Did you receive a visit from me, a week ago, Tuesday?' 'A visit from you?' he replied; 'Why we were more than a thousand miles at sea at that time. What made you think of a visit to me?' His wife then told him that on account of the severity of the weather and the loss of the *Africa*, which had left Liverpool for Boston the same day the *City of Limerick* had left for New York, she had been very anxious for his safety. On the night of the visit it seemed to her that she crossed a wide and stormy sea and came to a low black steamship, went up its side, and through the saloon to her husband's stateroom, and at the door saw a man on the upper berth looking straight at her, and so hesitated, but finally went up to Mr. Wilmot's berth and kissed and embraced him, and then came away. The description given of the steamship by

his wife and of the appearance of the stateroom, Mr. Wilmot says, was correct in every particular."

Hundreds of similar stories are given and vouched for by persons who are regarded reliable in other things, and have been investigated and pronounced trustworthy by those competent to judge. The fact is, no person well informed upon the subject pretends to deny that such communications have taken place.

There is another question, however, more interesting and important than the one just discussed, and that is the real question of this paper, to which what has been said so far, is intended to lead.

When we speak of ghosts we mean, as a rule, as we have seen, the souls of the departed. It is the general consensus of mankind that they survive their separation from the bodies with which they are connected in life. There must, therefore, be a realm of spirit, a ghostly universe, in which they live. They probably pass at death into a condition of larger freedom and more intense life, of fuller development and greater enjoyment than they had in this world. As social beings it is most likely that they communicate with one another in the spirit world. They undoubtedly recognize each other. Can they, from that other world, also communicate with us who are still in the flesh? That is the inquiry in which the student of the ghost question is interesting himself at the present time.

Communication with the ghostly universe or with representatives of it, if there be any, is not among the ordinary experiences of mankind. The very large majority of men never see ghosts. It is much easier to find those who make no claim to experiences of this kind than to discover those who do. But the question is, do ghosts under no circumstances appear? Is the spirit world so shut out from the physical world, which itself, in its highest form, is a spirit world too, a world pervaded and controlled by the spirit, that no one can, under any circumstances, return, who has once left "this

bourne of time and place," and appear to those still here and speak to them?

It is not difficult to conceive of such visits and communications. And there have been persons in all ages who have believed in them. We may call them credulous persons; but is not that begging the question? If the soul of the living can go a thousand miles in a moment to visit a friend, why may not the soul of one out of the body, through what we call dying, in a realm where time and space are no longer conditions of existence, visit and speak to those whom that soul knew upon the earth. Whilst such visits and communications are not common, it is claimed that many have taken place in the history of the human family. We know of no absolute reason why those once in the flesh, but now disembodied ghosts, should not come back, to use a common expression, and converse with their friends.

The poetry and folk-lore of all nations is full of accounts of such ghostly visitations. Was it not the ghost of Iphigenia that appeared to Orestes and prompted him to execute vengeance upon his mother Clytemnestra. In Virgil the shade of Creusa appears to Æneas. All through ancient literature ghosts are made to walk, here and there, and to play a more or less important part in human affairs. We also find them in modern literature. Banquo's ghost in Macbeth and the ghost in Hamlet are examples of their use for dramatic purposes. And they appear in literature because there was a popular belief in their existence and occasional appearance in real life.

Nor has this belief disappeared even in our day. And what is especially worthy of note is that many eminent scholars and leading men of our age are intensely interested in this subject and are investigating and studying it, testing the evidence for and against the reported appearances of ghosts and trying to explain the alleged phenomena. Among these are Hon. A. J. Balfour, the Marquis of Bute, Professor Henry Sidgwick, Bishop Ripon, W. T. Stead, Henry M. Stanley, Lady Henry Somerset, Professor Wm. James of Harvard,

Professor Langley of the Smithsonian Institution, Professors Butler and Hyslop of Columbia University, and a host of others of like standing and character in England, France, Germany, Russia and America. The late Hon. W. E. Gladstone, on accepting membership in the Society for Psychical Research, said that the work the members of this organization were doing was the most important work being done in the world at the present day.

When a child, the writer of this paper heard many ghost stories; and this is no doubt a common experience. One story was that a man who owned a farm near Fisher's Mill, on the Conewago Creek, in Adams Co., Pa., had a dispute with a neighbor about a boundary line, and, after his death he appeared regularly at night at a certain corner-stone beating upon it with the end of his walking stick. The children of the neighborhood were in terror of the spot at night and looked upon it with mingled curiosity and dread even in day-time.

Just lately two citizens of Somerset Co., Pa., told the writer that when they were boys, living between Allenvale and Somerset they frequently heard some one yelling in the ridge at night and were told that it was the ghost of an Indian. One of these men also said that his mother told him, a few years ago, that she often saw and heard this ghost, when a child.

Between Rimersburg and Curllsville in Clarion Co., Pa., there is a wooded swamp, which was known, twenty years ago, as "Spooky Hollow," on account of the ghosts said to have been seen there.

Anyone who takes the trouble to inquire can find plenty of people who profess to have seen ghosts. Some striking stories of this kind could be given here, did the limits of this paper afford room. Is it not reasonable to believe that something at least of reality lies at the foundation of so much popular belief? President Lincoln once said: "You can't fool all the people all the time."

A few instances of appearances after death are taken from

Rev. Arthur Chambers' book: "Man and the Spiritual World as Disclosed by the Bible."

"A highly educated friend, a lawyer, one day said to me, 'I want to tell you something, although I hardly expect you to credit it, in spite of the fact that, as a clergyman, you are supposed to believe in a spiritual world.' He then, in a most matter of fact way, . . . informed me that since her death he had seen his wife five times, and, on two of these occasions in broad daylight. Once she spoke to him and advised him against a business project which, had it been carried out, would have made him a ruined man. 'That person,' adds Rev. Mr. Chambers, 'was evidently sane, and I cannot think he was a liar.'"

"Two ladies, who were sisters, were sitting at needle work in a room in London. Happening to look up at the same time, they saw standing by them a fair-haired little girl, who, after a minute or more, vanished. Both the ladies were much astonished, and found, on comparing notes, that they had seen the same thing; and they made a record of the day and hour of the appearance. Four weeks later they had a letter from a sister in India enclosing a photograph of her little daughter who had lately died, whom these aunts had never seen and of whose sickness and death they had not previously heard. The two ladies immediately recognized the photograph as that of the child they had seen; and the time of the appearance corresponded exactly with the time of the death of the child."

The next two are taken from the "Widow's Mite," by Dr. I. K. Funk, the New York publisher:

"When I was a young man in my father's house, an aunt, who was visiting us, died suddenly one night, about midnight. Her son-in-law was a well-to-do farmer living about two miles in the country. The aunt had been in apparently good health up to a few minutes of her death. About the time she passed away the son-in-law went to a spring about a hundred yards from his house for water, and saw the form of his mother-in-

law standing by the spring as natural as in life, and yet he was somehow impressed that it was her spirit; he did not know of her death until the next morning."

"A Boston lady, Mrs. K., and her sister, Mrs. B., were interested in psychic investigations and had held sittings with a psychic, Mrs. E. On Friday morning, January 18, 1884, Mrs. K. was on a steamer *en route* from Boston to Savannah, which was wrecked on the rocks of Gays Head, the south-western point of Marthas Vineyard. The papers of Friday evening, January 18, had accounts of the disaster. On January 19, Dr. K., son of Mrs. K., hastened down to the beach in search of his mother's body. No trace of it was discovered, but he became satisfied that she was among the lost. He returned at night and spent Sunday in Boston. On Monday, the twenty-first, Mrs. E., the medium, came in and they decided to have a sitting. Immediately Mrs. K. claimed to be present, and told them: (1) That she had exchanged her inside stateroom for an outside one; (2) she had played whist with some friends in the steamer saloon that evening; (3) she did not die by drowning, but by a blow on the head. On Tuesday, the twenty-second, Dr. K. and a friend went to the beach again, and, after a long search among the bodies were able to identify that of the mother; and they found the right side of her head crushed in as by a blow. The other two facts stated at the sitting were afterwards also verified by survivors of the wreck."

The literature of this subject is extensive and gives many instances of the appearance of living persons to those at a distance from them and also of the departed and of communications from them to the living as remarkable as those here cited. Many of these narratives have been subjected to the most rigid tests by those competent to judge and have been pronounced trustworthy. The Society for Psychical Research has collected, sifted, and published a large number of them in its proceedings.

There has been much ignorance and superstition among

men in regard to the things discussed in this paper. Many persons have supposed, and even been convinced, that they saw ghosts when there was a perfectly natural explanation of what they saw. There is probably much fraud and deception practiced upon the credulous by professional mediums, which are often exposed; and the whole subject is then held up to ridicule. Mind-reading will account for some of the phenomena which have been observed. Dr. Hudson, who has written much on this and cognate subjects, has given out a theory that the subjective mind has the power, and that it does, under certain circumstances, create phantasms which appear objectively to certain persons both during the lifetime and also after the death of those creating and projecting them. These are seen and heard, and not only vaguely felt to be present, often by several persons at the same time and even by animals.

Dr. Hudson says at one point, however: "To the supposition that the phantoms of the dead are thus created is opposed but one other hypothesis, and that is, that the phantoms are the real spirits of the dead persons whom they represent."

Andrew Lang, in "Dreams and Ghosts," says: "Modern science, when it admits the possibility of occasional hallucinations in the sane and healthy also admits, of course, the existence of apparitions. The difficulty begins when we ask whether these appearances ever have any provoking mental cause outside the minds of the people who experience them—any cause arising in the minds of others, alive or dead. This is a question which orthodox psychology does not approach, standing aside from any evidence which may be produced."

But if orthodox psychologists do not approach it and admit the evidence of it many other persons do. Learned men, here and there, all over the world are earnestly inquiring into it. Dr. Hudson has investigated the subject and gives us a theory to account for the facts in the case. But not all persons interested in the subject are willing to accept the Hudson theory. There are those who believe that the souls or ghosts of the departed are not far from us, that the spiritual universe,

where the souls of the departed are, pervades the physical universe, and that, under certain psychic conditions, persons in that universe become visible and audible to those who have not yet passed beyond this earth.

Some of these persons believe, or at least hope, that the investigations now being made by earnest and able men to ascertain the truth of alleged ghostly appearances and to discover the laws of ghostly communication, will eventually be successful, and that, some time or other, well defined and indisputable intercourse will be established between the natural and the spiritual world, in addition to that which religion affords us.

We have accurate descriptions of distant continents and of what they contain of value and interest to us. We can communicate with persons who are traveling in those far-off quarters of the globe. It would only be one step further, a very long step, it is true, to receive accounts of the ghost continents written by those who had visited them, to converse occasionally with the departed, to be assured of their continued existence, to learn something of their present condition and employments, and to ascertain by such ghostly demonstration where and how we shall probably spend the period immediately following our separation from the body.

DUQUESNE, PA.

VI.

JAPANESE POETRY.

BY PROFESSOR J. K. MAEDA.

The standard form of Japanese poetry is a kind of verse consisting of five phrases or lines of 5, 7, 5, 7 and 7 syllables respectively—31 syllables in all. This form goes by the name of "Waka" ("Japanese poetry"). The oldest pieces were composed in the seventh century or earlier. There has been another type called "naga-uta" or "long poem," but it has not been much cultivated by Japanese writers. So the Waka has been the prevailing form for a number of centuries.

In the course of time some leisure-loving poets invented the art of composing a thirty-one syllable Waka by the coöperation of two persons, assigning the first three lines to one and the remaining two to the other. This artifice, as well as the resulting poem, was named "Renga" or "joint verse." Its origin also was not recent. But as a recognized form, it dates back not farther than the twelfth century.

In the hands of Yamazaki Sokan (1465-1553) and Arakida Moritake (1473-1549), leaders of the humorous school of the Renga, it came to drop its concluding lines, keeping its beginning phrases only. Hence the name "Hokku" or "starting phrases" for this new form. The Hokku is also called "Haikai" (contraction of "Haikai-ka," humorous poems) or "Haiku" (humorous phrases), from its nature in its early days.

As is clear from what has already been said, the Hokku or Haikai consists of three lines of 5, 7 and 5 syllables respectively, as in the following example:

*Kake-isuru
Koma mo ashi kagu
Sumire kana!*

Its English equivalent would be something like this:

Lo, the violets sweet!
There the running pony
Stops to smell its feet!

The ordinary Waka of thirty-one syllables is short enough as a complete verse. What wonderful genius to shorten it still further!

The new departure shortened the form, but it widened the range of the diction and the subject-matter, thus freeing poetry from its chains. The older composers were very fastidious and exact in the choice of subjects and words. Or, rather, both the subjects and the words were dictated by tradition. A certain number of subjects and words were consecrated as poetic, and others were excluded as vulgar. And the poets paid unconditional homage to tradition. So the art of versification came to require not a small degree of training, and became limited to a small class of people. Through the dark ages of the Kamakura and Muromachi periods, the circle of versifiers became smaller and smaller. Thus poetry became traditional, exclusive, aristocratic and professional. And a dozen or two of so-called poets used to compose over and over with this limited number of words, and always on the traditional subjects. No wonder that poetry became a musty sort of thing.

The Hokku was decidedly a reaction against this tendency. It admitted almost all kinds of words and expressions for its diction and nearly every aspect of life and nature as its subject. So it was easily accepted in all ranks of society, and people were glad to have a new and freer form of poetry.

As the origin of the Hokku suggests, the early compositions of this kind are mostly in the lighter vein. The following are some examples:

If thou'rt the nightingale's deserted child,
O cuckoo, cry thou keen and wild.

—*Arakida Moritake.*

The cuckoo is said to lay its eggs in the nest of the nightingale and let the latter take care of them. It is quite possible then that when they are hatched and grown the nightingale renounces the nestlings as alien creatures. At the same time the cuckoo is so famous for its constant crying that folk-lore tells us it is doomed to cry eight thousand and eight times a day. Hence the aptness of the poet's figure and his wit.

The lovely autumn moon—
For all men 'tis perhaps
The cause of noon-day naps.

—*Matsunaga Teitoku* (1571-1653).

Behold, behold! That's all I say. No rhyme
For Mount Yoshino in its flower time.

—*Yasuhara Teishitsu* (1604-1671).

What profusion!
Dew has dropped, not taking care,
Here and there and everywhere!

—*Nishiyama Soin* (1605-1682).

Following these masters appeared Matsuo Basho (1644-1694), the greatest name in this department of literature. He was born in a *samurai* family at Ueno, in the province of Iga. From his boyhood he served the *daimyo* of Ueno as an attendant of his son. At the death of the young master, Basho gave up his rank as *samurai* and went to Kyoto for study, his age being twenty-two. Six years later he moved to Yedo.

Young Basho spent a number of years in Yedo as an ordinary Hokku professor. But under Buddhistic influence, his sober nature and his unfortunate career gradually came to shake the shallow optimism, which was common to all Hokku writers in those days. Tired of jokes and jests, he began to take a profounder view of life and nature. His fortieth year marks a turning-point in his life as well as a new epoch in the history of the Hokku. The following piece which he composed is known as the standard of the new tendency, led by him, and called the "Seifu" or "right style":

Into an ancient pond
Now plunge the lazy frogs—
How wierd the sound!

This does not seem to mean much. But one should stop and think a little from the author's standpoint. It is late in spring. The gay and gorgeous part of the season is already gone. Nature appears rather sober and quiet. Breezes are soft and the rain is gentle. Now and then a frog plunges into an ancient and deserted pond. It sounds as if from the depth of the world, or rather from another world—a solitary yet deeper, truer and freer world. That poetic realm of tranquility and bliss was the one which Basho and his followers were seeking in the midst of this vain, mad world.

Another verse of similar nature by Basho is:

On the naked branches ravens idly stay,
In the twilight of a dreary autumn day.

The previous poem appeals to the ear; this to the eye. The poet tries to present the lonely autumn scene with a single stroke of the pen.

The dying autumn thrills my heart so deep—
For it does not become us men to weep.

This is elliptical. A whole clause is omitted between the two lines. Written out in full it might read something like this: The sad autumn scene is more than enough to make me weep. I refrain only because it does not become us men to weep. "Men must not weep." How hard a lot it is!

Wild summer grass all o'er the ancient castle sites—
The end of brilliant dreams of warriors and of knights!

There was a famous castle, or rather a group of castles, at Hiraizumi, near Ichinoseki, until about seven hundred years ago. The place was a military center, almost independent of the Imperial government of Kyoto. Fujiwara Kiyohira, the founder of this military government, and his successors were almost kings. But neither the castle nor the family lasted long. The Fujiwara family was defeated by Minamoto Yoritomo in its fourth generation, and so the pompous castle was destroyed. Basho visited the place about five hundred years later, and sighed and wept over the ruins for a while.

Then he tried to describe the sight with all its historical associations in a short Hokku.

On the same tour he visited the temple of Yamadera, in the vicinity of Yamagata, and composed a poem to tell how still and silent the surroundings were, which runs as follows:

No sound is heard, nay, none,
Save only a cicada's cry,
Enough indeed to thrill a stone.

This is strongly epigrammatic.

He went over to the province of Echigo and stayed one night at Izumozaki and composed there the following verse:

O'er the raging sea,
Sweeps the Milky Way,
Far to Sado's Bay!

This does not say much, but it opens a grand and imposing view before the eyes of one who has ever seen the Island of Sado lying in the boisterous Japan Sea, from the beach of Izumozaki. The night when he stayed there was a beautiful one. The sky was perfectly clear. The moon was still young and its rays were soft and tender. Numberless stars were beaming brightly. And the Milky Way was hung up high in the heavens. Only the sound of the billows disturbed the stillness of the scene. It was so impressive that his eyes were dimmed with tears.

The following is Basho's description of Mukojima, a place noted for its cherry blossoms, near his cottage in the Fukagawa district of Yedo:

A cloud of blossoms all around!
The bell—is it Ueno or Asakusa?

This may be expanded thus: "The cherry flowers in Mukojima are blooming in such profusion as to form a cloud which shuts out the prospect. Whether the bell which is sounding from the distance is that of the temple of Ueno or of Asakusa I am unable to determine."

Now let us take a glance at a few later poets, passing over Basho's immediate followers.

A cuckoo flyeth, crying as for pity,
Obliquely across the royal Heian City.

—*Taniguchi Buson* (1716-1783).

The poet attempts to describe in a short *Hokku* the early summer scene at the capital. The city of Kyoto being almost square and regularly divided, the word "obliquely" is very effective here. The cuckoo is very common in Japanese literature as the bird that indicates the coming of summer and also as an emblem of sorrow.

Through the chilly autumn gale,
To the Palace Tobaden
Hasten five, six cavalymen.

—*The same.*

Here the poet is more ambitious. He dares to tell within the compass of three lines the whole story of the political disturbance which happened in 1156. The retired emperor Sutoku, the head of the Opposition Party, lived in a building in the detached palace called Tobaden, until the outburst of the disturbance. Five or six horsemen hastening to Tobaden through the chilly autumn gale, to meet Emperor Sutoku there, represent the weaker force, and their destiny is also clearly seen at once.

How bright the full moon is!
The child cries eagerly,
"Please bring it here for me."

—*Issa* (1827).

Lo, the full moon bright!
Hard 'tis for a blind man's wife
Not to weep to-night!

This is doubtfully ascribed to the wife of Hanawa Hokiichi, a blind scholar. The loving wife wants to enjoy the beautiful full moon with her husband. But the stubborn fact that her desire is hopeless causes her to burst into tears.

We shall give the remaining space to the compositions of the poetess Kaga-no-Chiyo* (1702-1775):

* Chiyo of the Province of Kaga. The first example given in this article is by this author.

I wonder what 'tis dreaming;
 The sleeping butterfly
 Its tiny wings doth try.
 White chrysanthemums so pure!
 I fear to soil them with the finger tip,
 With which I've touched my rouged lip.
 Ev'n to view the moon,
 Maidens seek a shadowed place,
 As if it was at noon.

All her poems reflect their womanly authorship. They are preëminently tender and sympathetic. They are remarkably lucid and may be understood without any explanations. While Basho's poems are like oil paintings, Chiyo's verses are like water color pictures.*

The writer must confess that all the examples given above, being translations, are necessarily somewhat paraphrastic. Yet most of them are not very clear without some further explanation or expansion. It is because our poets do not give their poems in full, but strike only the keynote and stop there. Our nation at large seems to be quite frank and open. But our poets and artists are very reserved. Our painters, for instance, are not diligent, faithful copiers of things, but excel in suggestion. They try to make sketches of things with as few strokes as possible, and with these to remind people of real things. Our poets do the same. They attempt to suggest the whole piece by giving only the keynote. "The minimum effort and the maximum effect," seems to be their motto. It shows that they understand something of art, that they know some of the secrets of artists. But their excessive practice of this trick has greatly checked the development of Japanese art and poetry, which for this reason are left at the present stage of imperfect growth.

We are far from being worshipers of Basho or of Hokku.

* More Hokku will be found in Hearn's "Kotto" (1902), "A Japanese Miscellany" (1901), "Shadowings" (1900), "Exotics and Retrospectives" (1899), Aston's "Japanese Literature" (1899), Chamberlain's "Handbook of Colloquial Japanese" (1898), and Florenz's "Japanisch Dichtungen" (1894).

So we do not claim much for this kind of composition. We would be ridiculed if we claimed any great qualities for the seventeen syllable verses. But this much is true, that going through the field of Hokku literature, here and there we meet real little gems. They are as terse and suggestive as can be. Their sentiment is true, and their fancy is lovely. They are almost perfect in their own way. They often annoy and baffle ambitious translators. At the least they are flashes of poetry, though they may not be poetry itself; and flashes are always beautiful and attractive.

Their popularity is also undeniable. Basho found followers wherever he went on his tours. He was a great traveler, and at many places we find even to-day stone monuments inscribed with his verses in memory of his visits. Though he died at fifty in Osaka, on one of his excursions, his ten great disciples and a large number of other pupils formed an able band for the spread of the Hokku. Those disciples had their own disciples in turn, and by their united efforts Hokku writing came to be almost universal.

Nearly every village or town had a Hokku Society or two, and amateur poets met every month, with their professors in their midst. Each society edited a written monthly journal for circulation among its members. On special occasions they presented large board tablets containing their verses to temples and shrines to be hung under the eaves for exhibition. At the time of village festivals they hung big lanterns across the streets, with their compositions written on the paper shades. These were the means of publishing their masterpieces.

In proportion as the art of Hokku writing became common, its productions became commonplace. This was an inevitable tendency. So it is doubtful whether Hokku verses in those days had any literary merit. But the practice had some worth as a means of general culture. It taught even uneducated people to stop and more carefully look at life and nature, in the midst of the busy strife of this world.

The introduction of journalism to Japan has given Hokku

composers new and better opportunities of publishing their compositions and of spreading their art. The pages of magazines and newspapers show that at the present time the art is flourishing more than ever and a great quantity of Hokku is being produced day by day. The poets have a number of monthly organs with the *Hototogisu* at the head of the list; and among the daily papers the *Nippon* is known as the greatest patron of the Hokku. There are many masters among the educated class of people and they are making efforts to save the Hokku from becoming dry and prosy. Something is being done in the way of improving this kind of composition; but there is reason to doubt whether it has much of a future.

SENDAI, JAPAN.

VII.

THE CHURCH AND MEN OF WEALTH.

THE REV. JAMES R. BROWN, A.M.

This theme presents two factors. Neither requires an exhaustive definition. The "Church" we shall speak of as the whole body of Christian believers, regardless of particular denominational affiliation. By "men of wealth" we mean those who have within their possession and control much more money or useful property than they need to meet the ordinary wants of the average individual or family.

This discussion shall deal with the mutual relations between these two factors. We might treat this relation as it obtained during the past, pointing out successes and failures, in order to learn, on the one hand, how to steer clear of bygone errors and, on the other hand, how to follow in the wake of earlier successes. This would be both interesting and profitable. However, it is more in harmony with our present purpose to take up this relation as we find it to-day, and to consider the mutual help the church and men of wealth do, can and ought to render each other. Of course, in speaking of the possible and ideal relations between the two, our judgment must take into account and largely rest on the lessons of the past.

I. DUTIES OF THE CHURCH TO MEN OF WEALTH.

First note some of the characteristics of these men with whom the church must deal. We seem to have several types of men of wealth. We find the parvenus who usually are vulgar and loud with their newly gained possessions. They became rich suddenly. From their circle come many of those whose God is Epicurus, and who usually, according to their own phrase, "have no use for the church."

Again, we have those who were born with the golden spoon

in their mouth. Many of these grew up without learning anything of the seriousness and stress of the average life. They can neither toil nor spin. They can neither pull an oar nor handle a rudder because they have only been drifting, and depending on others to keep the boat in safe waters. Among these we find the moral weaklings who count for very little either positively or negatively. Many of them are in the church but not of the church.

A third type we find in those who fought and wrought hard and long and successfully in the mad struggle and conflict to win wealth. They commenced at the bottom. They know the cost of every cent in a dollar. By perseverance, insight, foresight and wise economy they built up their fortune. Among these are the strong men of the times. They are our captains of industry and finance. They are the great motors moving the multitudinous and enormous wheels of commerce. A very large percentage of these are enrolled in the church; and many of them are working just as hard in and for the church as in their business. Many of them are doing a fair and square business and endeavor to live up to the golden rule. Others seem to have two codes of morals—one for Sunday and another for the week day.

From these facts it is apparent that it is improper to speak of men of wealth as a body when we want to consider the duties which the church owes them because, after all, the individual or human element plays a far more important part than the financial element. Generalizing inevitably proves unjust and unfair to some and consequently must be avoided here as far as possible, as it should be nearly always in dealing with men.

What, then, is the attitude of the church toward these types of men? Probably we should ask what is the attitude of churches or congregations toward them, for there are churches and churches even as there are men of wealth and men of wealth.

Some congregations and even some denominations are reputed

to fawn to the wealthy and aristocratic. It is said that they pride themselves that they have the "best" people in the community, overlooking the fact that the term "best" people is very elastic, and that its real significance often depends far more on the subjective than on the objective element. It is claimed that every wish and whim of the wealthy is gratified: that their will must domineer because money talks. In spite of such assertions and claims it seems to me that the churches which are guilty of such things are the rare exception and not the rule.

On the whole I believe that the Christian church primarily looks upon men as men, and only secondarily on men as poor or wealthy, weak or strong, ignorant or intelligent. The *man* is the *essential* and the *wealth* is the *incidental*. But from this it must not be inferred that the incidental is unimportant or insignificant. The man and his wealth are intimately related, and the church should and does recognize this fact. But the church also bears in mind that it is her office to minister to the spiritual or soul element and therefore her ministrations are effected in such a manner that all things may work together for this one end. Consequently the church does not overlook the men of wealth, nor men's wealth; but she has an honest and fair interest in them.

Hitherto no doubt many churches failed to do their full duty toward the wealthy even as many wealthy failed to do their duty toward the church. We shall therefore now turn from a further consideration of the present actual relations to a partial consideration of the more prominent features of the possible and ideal relations.

With all men the church must deal fearlessly yet fairly, judiciously yet kindly, firmly yet lovingly. It must be remembered that a man of wealth is not a monster at heart. He has a better side on which he is accessible. To find this, and to reach him properly, something must be learned of his life, and of the methods and manner in which he acquired his wealth. Did he suddenly become rich? Then bear in mind

that he is likely to be like a boy jumping from the use of a penny or a nickel to the use of hundreds of dollars. He is not prepared for the stewardship.

Again, it must be asked whether he became rich through trickery or sharp dealing, through oppression or outright dishonesty. Such facts dare not be left out of the account in dealing with such a man. Nor dare the church fail to do her part, on the one hand, in branding such wrongs in money-making as have come to the surface during the past year, so as to *create a public sentiment* which condemns them so ruthlessly that the guilty ones shall feel its sting more keenly than any other punishment; nor, on the other hand, dare she fail to herald the superior greatness of honor and righteousness so as to create more of that public sentiment which exalts true character above all else.

In many cases it is doubtless difficult to get at the citadel of these parvenus because there is a wall of worldliness in the way. But by patient and wise efforts the gospel trumpet can be so blown that in many instances, when the seventh round is made, the wall falls.

What can the church do for those who are so unfortunate (I use this term seriously) as to be born in a wealthy family? In some way these must be impressed with the dignity and superiority of a life of honest usefulness. To many of these a careful and vivid presentation of a life of effort, regardless of wealth already possessed, like that of the late A. J. Cassatt, will surely be stimulating and helpful. But, says some one, that is not preaching the gospel. I would not be dogmatic on this point, but it seems to me that every true and worthy life is good gospel and deserves to be preached. Many who would only drift if left to themselves can be spirited into the race by appealing to the strong, the heroic and the chivalric; and these qualities have an ample sphere for activity in many of the simpler yet grand duties of everyday life.

Whilst it is not easy to reach these two types directly as long as they are not closely identified with the church, never-

theless, if a true church life and spirit pervades a community these men can be reached quite effectually through the indirect activity of the church. Each member stands for something and diffuses a mighty influence for good when he is loyal to Emanuel's flag. *God uses good men to make better men.* To the degree that the church impresses this upon all her members to that degree she will enlarge her usefulness to men of wealth.

And now, how about the church and those men of wealth who have toiled hard and long for their wealth? I said we had many of these in the church. Among them are found some of the most useful and self-sacrificing members. Too frequently these earnest souls are misunderstood or misjudged by the poor people. They are the objects of envy and jealousy. Unkind and uncharitable expressions are made about them. Fault is found with the way they administer their wealth if not with the way it has been acquired.

In this case the church has a twofold duty. First, she must recognize the perplexity of the poor man who hears Dives say, "there must be rich and poor," but who cannot explain that mysterious and often unaccountable lottery of life which gives to one man purple and fine linen and sends to the other rags for garments and dogs for comforters. She must show Lazarus that those whose names are not in the millionaires roster are generally exempt "from the misery of Damocles who sits on satin cushions, and is served on gold plate, but has an awful sword hanging over his head in the shape of an hereditary disease or a family secret which peeps out every now and then from the embroidered arras in a ghastly manner, and will be sure to drop one day or another in the right place." She must also help Lazarus to see that even in this life he has or can have his good things which in reality are more precious than the gold of Dives.

Again, and more emphatically, the poor man must be reminded that many wealthy ones are living more economically than the poor, and that they do this not out of meanness but from a sense of right and duty. Nor dare the poor be allowed

to overlook the fact that often the rich man works and worries to keep the industrial wheels moving for the purpose of giving employment to the laborer rather than for gain for himself.

This is one phase of the church's duty toward this type of men of wealth, and it is an exceedingly delicate side of it because very frequently the poor blame the church for partiality to the rich when in reality she is only concerned about having them fairly treated and set right in the eyes of the world.

The second phase of the church's duty has in view her more direct dealing with these men of wealth. They need her sympathy and warm-hearted Christian fellowship, her philosophy of life and her code of ethics, her quickening touch and ennobling spirit.

Some time ago there appeared in *The Outlook* several articles on "The Neglected Rich." No doubt the theme seemed strange to many readers. However, there is a larger measure of truth in it than one might be willing to admit at first sight. Doubtless many of the worthy wealthy of the third type often long for genuine sympathy and true fellowship—for that fellowship which rests on a common human interest in matters pertaining to time and to eternity. It is in and through the church directly and indirectly that this can and should be supplied.

The church can and should furnish the best philosophy of life to guide the wealthy in rightly relating their efforts for the establishment of justice, mercy and peace in the associated life of man. The philosophy of life illustrated in the career of Jesus has never been transcended. It is still supreme as the guide for the properly balanced life. The same source supplies us with the noblest code of ethics. In this connection the church cannot impress men too deeply with the words of our truly patriotic President: "It is far more important that rich men should conduct their business affairs decently than that they should spend the surplus of their fortunes in philanthropy." She must also call men's attention to what Dr. C.

R. Brown means when he says: The day has past when it is permissible for a man haughtily to assert his right to run his own business in his own way, whether his way be right or wrong. In connection with this thought Dr. Brown says that the following words of Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, are still applicable: "My own! What is it? From what sacred place hast thou brought it into the world? Thou who hast received the gifts of God thinkest thou that thou committest no injustice in keeping for thyself alone what would be the means of life to many? It is the bread of the hungry that thou keepest; it is the clothing of the naked that thou lokest up; the money thou buriest is the redemption of the wretched." These incisive words voiced for his time and for all time the sense of obligation which ought to attach to the ownership of property, to the control of industrial enterprises, and to all those forms of influence which bear upon the welfare of one's fellows.

Surely when the wealthy read that it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God, they should be impressed with the difficulties and responsibilities resting on them. Under this burden they need the quickening touch of God through the church to aid them in holding and administering their large possessions in a truly Christian way. Doubtless many a sincere man of wealth has found it a more severe task properly to administer than to amass a fortune.

II. DUTIES OF MEN OF WEALTH TO THE CHURCH.

It remains now to refer in part to what men of wealth are doing and can do for the church. And for their own soul-development I believe that they *derive more benefit from what they do for the church than they derive from what the church does for them.*

By their active and consistent membership they testify to the world that something is to be found in the church which cannot be found in money or might or anything else. Their well-trained judgment and foresight, their tact and persever-

ance, together with their fertile resourcefulness, all find ample opportunity for application to the manifold and often perplexing problems which continually arise in the congregation and in the church at large. Let me guard against being misunderstood here. I would not lead any one to infer that only men of wealth possess these qualities; but I mean that almost invariably men of wealth do possess them. And it is but right that the church should profit, as she often has profited, by the readiness and liberality with which men of wealth give their valuable time and experience to her service.

The church as an institution among men, having manifold and varied activities, requires a material equipment which is frequently quite expensive. Probably never before could men of wealth find better or more worthy opportunities to use their wealth as well as themselves to meet the requirements of the day for adequately equipped churches, schools, orphanages, hospitals and the like. Surely never before were all forms of benevolent activities supported so liberally as at present; nevertheless, the present should be but an earnest of what is still in store for the future. Men of wealth have been liberal in the past, are liberal in the present, and can and should be still more liberal in the future in their financial support of the church and all her agencies. To the credit of, and in justice to, the rich let me say that I believe that a genuine appeal to a man of wealth for the support of anything of which he can be shown the need and reasonableness is scarcely ever made in vain.

In conclusion, first, both the church and men of wealth must learn to use a true standard of values in estimating the real worth of wealth. Even wealth may be bought at too high a price, as the following incident proves:

"Clara," asked a lady of an old school friend whom she was visiting, "how is your husband getting on?" "Miserably," answered the wife. "Why, how is that? Isn't he making a lot of money?" "Oh, yes," answered the wife, "John is making a lot of money. Some people call him rich, but I

call him poor. When we began life, we read together; we had our church; we had our social hours with friends. Now John has sold himself to work. He has no evenings. He has no Sunday. He puts everything back into his business and puts all of himself into it, and is a perfect slave."

Second, both must cultivate a keener sense of responsibility for the truest and wisest use of wealth. I believe that the wealthy need a stronger desire to see their money do good while they live. This would often obviate the frustration of cherished purposes after death.

Third, probably above everything else the crying need to-day for both is a decided raise in the standard which is to decide between legitimate and illegitimate methods of acquiring wealth. Whilst this presents a wonderfully difficult and complex problem, yet its difficulty dare not deter us from making honest efforts to solve it.

For the realization of these three things we must have the fullest coöperation and confidence between the church and the best men of wealth, and both must be ready to follow the guidance of the Spirit of the Great Master.

ESTERLY, PA.

VIII.

CONTEMPORARY RELIGIOUS AND THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT IN GREAT BRITAIN AND AMERICA.

BY THE REV. A. S. WEBER, D.D.

THE ORIGINALITY OF JESUS.

One of the most notable characteristics of current religious and theological literature is the multiplied number of books dealing exclusively with the teachings of Jesus. We have all read Wendt, and Nicoll, and Horton, and Ross, and Stevens, and Gilbert, and others' contributions to the varied phases of this interesting and important discussion; and from present indications the body of this literature is so far from completion that we shall probably be invited to read what many others will have to say on the subject. Widely differing interpretations are put by scholars upon this or that particular recorded saying of our Lord. Amid those differences one is struck, however, in finding one point of general if not universal agreement in their conclusions. At least so far as the outward letter of those teachings is concerned, the utterances of Jesus can be paralleled from earlier existing sources. On the score of terminology, it is affirmed, the originality of Jesus as a religious teacher cannot be maintained.

"It should be said immediately," says one of the more recent writers on the question, "that it is hard to prove that Jesus introduced any absolutely new religious conceptions. He himself felt that he was not revolutionizing, but completing. He was conscious of breaking at serious points with the religion of his times, but he was also insistent that the religion of his times was a degenerate form of the religion of the Old Testament. To the teachers of his day he said, 'Ye have made the Word of God of none effect through your tradition.'

The Old Testament was his refuge in temptation, and the keeping of its commandments was the method he recommended to obtain eternal life. In it we find the central truths of his gospel either clearly uttered by some rare man, or at least suggested.”*

Upon first blush, confident assertions of this nature will doubtless seem somewhat rash and venturesome if not wholly unwarranted by ascertainable facts on record in the Hebrew Scriptures. The author anticipates this, and proceeds to justify his position. “If we think of Jesus as demanding mercy rather than sacrifice,” he observes, “we find he was anticipated by Amos and Micah; if we think of him as emphasizing the love of God rather than the struggles of man after righteousness, we find Hosea doing the same; if we find him rejoicing in present personal trust on God rather than in the expectation of national purification and supremacy, we can say no less of the author of the twenty-third Psalm; if we realize that he lived in an inner and eternal world, we see in the seventy-third Psalm the ecstasy of one of the earliest venturesome believers in immortality, and we find the belief in immortality widespread among the Jews when Jesus came; if we think of his wonderful declarations of the fatherly attitude of God, we find a dim suggestion of it in Isaiah, as applied to a group of Israelites, though for a clear belief in it as applied to individuals we must look to the Apocrypha; if, finally, we remember his summary of the moral law and his refusal to separate the love of God from the love of man, we discover an unusually close parallel in Jeremiah’s summary of Josiah’s life, which he addressed to Josiah’s scoffing son: ‘Did not thy father eat and drink and do justice? then it was well with him. He judged the cause of the poor and needy; then it was well with him. Was not this to know me, saith the Lord?’ It is no wonder that Jesus said, ‘I am come not to destroy, but to fulfill.’”

*“The Religious Value of The Old Testament,” by Ambrose White Vernon. T. Y. Crowell and Co., New York, 1907.

A stronger test as to the validity of the position maintained by indicating general resemblances between the teachings of Jesus and the lofty conceptions of Hebrew seers, can be applied to the problem by making the definite inquiry, What are the basal doctrines, distinctively new, which we owe to the great Teacher come from God? Is the doctrine of the divine Unity one of them? That is the central truth of the Israel's religion. Is the doctrine of a merciful Providence one of them? That is the keynote of the great hymn which Jews sang long before Jesus' advent,—“The Lord is my Shepherd, I shall not want.” Did Jesus originate the doctrine of the Deity's spirituality? That was distinctly emphasized by him who ages earlier asked, “Whither shall I go from thy Spirit? Whither shall I flee from thy presence? Thou hast beset me behind and before, and laid thine hand upon me.” It was not the doctrine of the Holy Spirit acting upon and communing with our spirits, invigorating and purifying the fountains of our life, for that is implied in the prayer, “Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me!” It was not the doctrine of the continuance of life after death, for the class among the Jews marked off by disbelief of this, were reminded by Jesus that the words they used implied the truth of what they denied, “God is not the God of the dead but of the living!” It was not the doctrine of the universal Fatherhood, for “God created man in his own image,” and as Paul acknowledged, heathen poets dwelt upon the fact that man was a divine offspring, and that the inspiration of the Almighty giveth him understanding. It was not the doctrine of free grace and merciful forgiveness, for what language could make this plainer than that which for generations had been spoken in the ears of every child of Abraham, “Let the wicked forsake his ways, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God for he will abundantly pardon.” It was not the doctrine that there is no acceptable worship apart from spiritual service, for did not the penitent Psalmist

acknowledge that "the sacrifices of God are a broken spirit, a broken and contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise." It was not the doctrine of religious duty, whose inexhaustible springs are eternally fixed in the reason, the affections, and the will of man, for age-old when Jesus quoted it, was the greatest of the commandments, "Thou shalt love God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength; and thy neighbor as thyself."*

If, then, the originality of Jesus is not to be discovered in the newness of the doctrines which he taught, what is it that constitutes the crowning distinction which confessedly belongs to him? What is it that he has brought for the enduring enrichment of human knowledge, and for the transfiguring of human life and character? For answer to such questions, we must give attention primarily to the unique Personality of Jesus rather than to the teachings that were promulgated by him. In a Manhood which always defies the possibility of bringing it within simply human categories, he impersonated the Divine in an absolutely supreme and perfect union. What he taught, even though every word of it might be found in the sacred writings of the Jews, was, through his peerless Personality, given new spiritual content, life-bestowing power, and religious significance. Only from this view-point can it be said of him that he "made all things new." The renewal he accomplished was wrought not by innovation, reversal, or revolution, but by building upon ancient foundations, by quickening, exemplifying, fulfilling to utmost perfection, the ends to which all men are called to aspire, and by divine assistance promised to attain. "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect."

This was his holy office, namely, to give men a knowledge of their heavenly Father, to restore the broken fellowship between them, to win them to a trustful obedience to his holy will. That Father God, Jesus himself knew, always obeyed,

* Cf. "Laws of Life after the Mind of Christ," by J. Hamilton Thom. Longmans and Co., London. Vol. I., pp. 12-15.

and with him he lived in undisturbed communion, in the hallowed relationship of spirit with spirit. His office was not to preach abstract truths concerning God, but in personal life to mirror forth the divine Reality, in order to reveal in all its splendor the effulgence of the eternal Godhead unto men. Owing to this supreme achievement, not to any formal doctrine or sum of doctrines taught by him, he stands before men with an authority from which there is no appeal, with an attractiveness which all who know him acknowledge by worshipping him as the Son of the eternal Father. We have no other means of coming to a knowledge of God, no other source from which to draw inspiration to trust and obey him, that is at all worthy of being compared with that furnished us by his incarnate Example. "No man cometh unto the Father except by me." This is true, one remembers hearing the late Doctor Nevin insisting with sturdy emphasis in one of his last sermons, of coming to him in our thinking no less than of our coming as saved beings into actual personal fellowship with him in his glorious heavenly presence. This is the supreme, the enduring originality of Jesus, an originality which our age is profoundly in need of recognizing anew. For only as this unique office of Jesus is recognized, will men bring him the honor and reverence which are his due, and bow as he did in humble, obedient, and adoring worship before the Father whom he has revealed. "If ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also." "We beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image, from glory to glory, as by the Spirit of the Lord.

WHAT IS THE WORD OF GOD?

This question figured prominently in the religious controversies of England a generation ago. Large numbers of the Anglican clergy at one time, it may be remembered, united in a declaration that "the Bible not only contains, but is the Word of God." Against this, Frederick Denison Maurice raised his voice in strong and solemn protest. Readers of his

Life and Letters will recall with what insistent and repeated emphasis he affirmed the position taken by his ministerial brethren to be not only an unwarranted exaggeration, but a perilous misstating of the truth. Coming from one whom Matthew Arnold regarded next to Spinoza, the most God-inebriated man that had appeared in Europe, the affirmation is all the more arresting. It was his firm and abiding conviction that, as St. John taught and as George Fox taught, *the Word of God* was very much above the Scriptures, however truly he may speak by and in the Scriptures. He asserted that the Bible became dearer and more sacred to him the more he read it; that he had probably too little sympathy for its critics, and none at all with its arraigners. Still, he revered it not as the Word of God,—a title which belonged in his view to the “Living Word” alone,—but because of the help which it afforded in revealing the eternal Father in his true character and loving relation, unto men. The expression “Word of God,” he contended, is nowhere employed in the Bible in such a sense as to allow the name “Scripture” to be substituted for it as its equivalent.*

It is interesting and significant that amid the controversies of to-day as to the nature of the Bible, similar views should once more require utterance. The reason for it, is of course to be found in the fact that Bibliolatry still survives, and that for certain Protestants the supposed inerrancy of a Book is as binding in its letter and authority, as is the “Man on the Tiber” for the Roman Catholic communion. Where this view is prevalent, the pulpit naturally feels called upon to apply needed corrective as regards the conception of what is the Word of God, and it is not surprising to find that in so doing men return to the position maintained so vigorously by Frederick Maurice.

In his illuminating discussion of the “Old and New Conceptions of the Sacred Scriptures” an eminent American theologian and scholarly preacher makes the inquiry: “Is the

* “Maurice’s Life and Letters,” Vol. 2, pp. 500, 501, 603.

Bible God's Word?" The skill with which he answers the question is impressive as the conclusion he reaches is convincing. "That is not a good title for the Bible. When you call sixty-six books the Word of God, you say something which is open to serious objection, and which leads to countless misunderstandings. God's Word is in the Bible; but many things in the Bible are not God's Word. The lie told by the serpent, the foolishness spoken by Job's friends, the cry of Jeremiah, 'O Lord God, thou hast deceived me,'—these and much else are not the Word of God. Jesus Christ is the Word of God. 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.' And it is this Word which speaks softly and intermittently in the Old Testament, more clearly and more gloriously in the New. We see gleams of it in the Prophets and in the Psalms; it blazes out in the Gospels."* Upon grounds like these the preacher under reference bases his negative answer to the question, "Did God write the Bible?" That, concerning its infallibility, he replies to by insisting upon its profitableness for religious guidance and instruction, its unmatched usefulness in serving men's best interests. And that, concerning its inspiration, is successfully met by directing attention to its inspirational value for everyone that faithfully accepts the divine principles and diligently practices the hallowing precepts which it contains.

From the pulpit of an equally distinguished British thinker and preacher, there have been recently heard utterances which in their practical outcome are substantially the same. This is the more remarkable because in general theological attitude the two are more widely apart than the distance across the water which separates them. The American quoted is outspoken in his support of advanced and advancing religious ideas. The Englishman is ultra-conservative in the theological conceptions to which he holds. "Now here is the Bible," the latter observed in the published sermon from which his

* See, "Things Fundamental," by the Rev. Charles E. Jefferson, D.D. Thomas Y. Crowell and Co., New York.

words are taken, "here is the Bible which we all love and reverence. Is it the Word of God? Is it not rather He who became flesh and dwelt among us full of grace and truth that is to be alone known and spoken of by that phrase? *The Word of God is Jesus Christ, and on him we are to believe, to him we are to hearken. "This is my beloved Son, hear ye him."* It is the Christ that gives direction to his Church. Christ is the Saviour of Christianity. Over and over again in history it has been proved that nothing is of supreme importance except the faith that is wrought by the love of him. The Word of God is not a part of speech that the critic can dissect, and the copyist can misconstrue, and the compositor can misspell. It is not something that is liable to accidents of that sort. Nay, the Word of God is never written with ink on paper. The Word of God proceeds ever out of the mouth of God; it is warm with the breath of Almighty life; it will ever resound with the power of Almighty love from the incarnate Word, the only-begotten of the Father."* So long as Christian faith is anchored in the living, personal, Word of God, the new views of Scripture have no power of seriously disturbing or dislodging it.

STRIKING ANEW A VANISHED NOTE IN PREACHING.

At home and abroad religious leaders are expressing their conviction that to strike anew the vanished note of the exceeding sinfulness of sin, is one of the prime necessities of the present-day preacher of the Gospel. The changes which have taken place, and are continuing to do so with great rapidity, in the world of letters, business, social conventions, popular philosophy, public and private amusements, national aggrandizement, and individual aims and ambitions, have correspondingly affected the ethical and religious atmosphere of the churches. Imperceptibly no doubt, but to an extent that has escaped superficial observers, a spirit foreign to the noblest moral and

* "Romanism and Ritualism in Non-Conformity," by the Rev. J. Morgan Gibbon. In the *Christian World Pulpit* for October 21, 1906.

spiritual life, has crept into the Christian mind and injured its sensitiveness in clearly distinguishing between good and evil, right and wrong. As the result, men look with too large a tolerance upon low ethical standards, and condone too readily moral lapses in both themselves and others. They do not realize the enormity of sin, and so in many of its subtler forms as now prevailing, fail to hold themselves distinctly aloof from it.

This easy-going spirit of current Christianity is attributable in many instances to what has been called "perplexity of soul" rather than to a perversity of will in regard to duty. "Men have not ceased to want to do right," says Professor Shailer Mathews in the pages of his highly valuable and timely volume which has just made its appearance, "but they have become confused as to what really constitutes right. The growing moral sense refuses to submit to the control of the past, but is not convinced as to just what course of conduct the newer ideals demand. Just at present we are seeing how acute the struggle between the old and the new can become because of the determined effort to identify legality with morality. Laws that have been neglected are now being enforced. Sins that have been laughed at are now being punished."* These signs of a reviving morality in the affairs of civil life make it more than opportune for preachers to lay more urgent stress upon the eternal and important distinction between right and wrong; they bring encouragement and reassurance to their hearts in endeavoring to acquaint men with the ruin and guilt that sin involves, and suggest that men will still welcome the message that tells of pardon through Jesus Christ. These are not times when the pulpit should allow transgressors of the divine law to shelter themselves beneath specious phrases about evil being only good in the making, or a mere falling short, a stage in their moral evolution. Preachers should wash their hands of the taint

* "The Church and the Changing Order," by Shailer Mathews. The Macmillan Co., New York, June, 1907.

of antinomianism, and instead of treating sin lightly as a mere shadow of righteousness, declare it to be that which comes as a hideous and damning thing between the soul and God.

So long as men cannot be made to realize this, the Church will not be able to lift them into a higher and purer moral and religious region of life and character. Doctor Mathews justly observes, "it is idle to preach the Gospel to people who regard it as a means of mere literary culture. The average man will not call a physician until he is convinced that he is ill. The pulpit has partly abandoned attempts to arouse moral discontent in the human soul and has been giving prominence to congratulatory descriptions of men as the sons of God. Admirable as this hopefulness may be, it will be a sad day for society if its moral teachers undertake to widen the strait gate and broaden the narrow way." The man who spoke to a great audience a short while ago in Westminster Abbey was not far wrong in the contrast he drew between the popular theology at the beginning of the nineteenth century, and that at the beginning of the twentieth. One of the greatest faults of the former was that it manufactured agnostics by the thousand, and another that it saddled us with a popular theology which in its reaction from the other has surely gone too far in the opposite direction. "If the God of the nineteenth century was always frowning, the God of the twentieth century is always smiling. Religion in consequence has become a kind of fixed smile that sometimes nauseates one as much as the fixed smile on the faces of popular actresses." Christian congregations need to hear sermons on Paul's text, "Behold the goodness and the severity of God," or, as Professor Mathews put it, "society needs to be convinced afresh of the elemental distinction between evil and good as redefined by the changing condition of our ever more complex life. Knowledge is not a virtue and art is not righteousness. A social order devoted to either must be steadied by ideals that are drawn from the fundamentals of the Gospel of Jesus for which the Church stands." If the

preachers of to-day will sound the needed note in their preaching, who can doubt that the results will insure the better moral and religious to-morrow for which we are praying.

CHRISTIANITY AND WEALTH.

When it is recalled how much is said in the New Testament about material wealth, its duties and responsibilities, its deceitfulness and despotism, its enslaving power and ruining peril, it cannot be supposed to be an easy matter to give an undue proportion of consideration to it. Especially in an age and country like ours, whose wealth-producing capacity is almost fabulous, and the scramble for it simply furious, and the number of men amassing enormous fortunes unprecedented in history, it is no wonder that much should be thought and written about it. Touching every region and activity and concern of human life as Christianity does, our religion must necessarily take account of the method and purposes of acquiring riches, of the use and abuse to which they are put, and of rights and wrongs belonging to their possession and transmission. In other words, Christianity has to teach the ethics of wealth, and to do it in accordance with the principles laid down in the teachings of Jesus in the Gospel.

Here, however, as upon other important questions of morals, the interpreters of these principles come to conclusions which are not simply at variance, but in hostile conflict. Literalistic interpreters of certain utterances of the Master strenuously insist that wealth cannot be regarded as a gift of God, no matter how a man may have come into its possession, but that it is a curse pure and simple for the man himself, and an iniquitous wrong as related to fellow men. Upon this view so far as drawn from Christian teachings, the socialistic out-cry against wealth is based. One declares that on the question of money "the Church has sold out to the devil, it has renounced the principles of Jesus, it has allowed itself to be bound hand and foot by the god of this world." Another shrieks, "the ministry is nearly always on the side of the rich

and cares not for the poor. Away with the churches! Down with the clergy! Curses upon those that hold the accumulated fortunes which the poor have earned and of which they have been robbed!" Laveleye, the Belgian political economist, in his book on "Primitive Property" asserts that "were Christianity taught and understood conformably to the spirit of its Founder, the existing social organism could not last a day." The English author of "Social Rights and Duties" says that "if a man who best represents the ideas of early Christians were to enter a respectable circle of competitive money-makers to-day, he would be likely to send for the police for his own and others' protection." And all this from the pens of such as profess in some sense to accept and to be interpreters of the principles enunciated in the New Testament. From the writings of pronounced atheistic socialists, language far more rash and condemnatory as regards existing conditions respecting riches and property, could easily be instanced. For present purposes this is not necessary.

The wide-reaching influence of the sort of literature that has been mentioned, is as specious and one-sided as it is misleading and injurious to the cause of truth and righteousness. Accordingly one may well rejoice in finding men, with clearer vision and unbiased judgment, addressing themselves to the task not only of counteracting the writings of prejudiced errorists, but of setting the relation of Christianity and wealth in the larger perspective demanded by its many-sided and intricate aspects. The work of these men deserves not simply the recognition of individual religious leaders here and there, they should be given the widest possible circulation among thinking people and receive their careful and studious attention.

Of such works, there are four that may in this connection be recommended to the readers of this JOURNAL as eminently worthy of their consideration, and as sure to repay them for

the time given to the study of them.* Within the limits of space remaining at one's command at present in these pages nothing approaching a proper statement of the character of the contents of these publications, or adequate appraisal of their significance and value, can be undertaken. With reference to Littleton's "Studies" it must suffice to say that it is one of the most scholarly and satisfactory treatises on the points of the Sermon on the Mount it deals with, that is available in the English language. It throws a flood of light upon the particular words of the Saviour that have frequently been perplexing to those that are scrupulously desirous of complying with his instructions. To those having socialistic inclinations it will bring steadying power and the assistance that they need in applying the Lord's principles to the proper conduct of their thought and life. Gledstone's discussion of the interesting question as to the right of Christians making fortunes succeeds in doing two important things for the Church and the men of ability and sagacity in its membership. It justifies the latter in seeking in honest and upright ways to come into possession of large wealth, and it enforces the duty of bringing it into the service of the latter for the advancement of God's glory and the well-being of men.

In the fifteen compact chapters which make up President Eliot's delightful and instructive little volume, the new kind of rich men that have come into existence are described, and the new forms of the riches indicated. The public admires and envies them; sees that they are often serviceable, criticises and blames them also, and to some extent fears them. Some are disposed to think them dangerous to the Republic and a blot on democratic society. Meanwhile, however, there are both advantages and disadvantages brought to the owners and to the community by the great modern riches of the million-

* "Studies in the Sermon on the Mount Concerning Riches," by Littleton. London. "Should Christians Make Fortunes?" by Gledstone. London. "Great Riches," by President Eliot, of Harvard. Crowell & Co., New York. "Wealth and Worth," by W. U. Hensel. Published privately, Lancaster, Pa.

aires. Among the advantages noticed are the comforts, the pleasures, the luxuries, the objects of beauty, the aids to health, the improvement of land, the educational advantages, and the relief of distress and suffering that can be provided for by them. The most serious disadvantages under which very rich people labor is in the bringing up their children, defending them from habits of self-indulgence, laziness, and selfishness; and in performing the responsibilities inherent to the power that attends wealth, a sense of which responsibility may become so painful as to quite overcome all enjoyments made possible by riches. In themselves great riches rightly acquired are not an evil. Like most other things and forces in this world, those who possess them are a mixed product, and may work either good or evil for themselves and their children, for their neighborhood and their nation, in accordance with the use or misuse made of them. From all which the conclusion is reached that it is not wrong for a man to make and use a large fortune, and quite unnecessary in this country for its citizens to feel alarm about the rise of a permanent class of very rich people.

The brochure on "Wealth and Worth," by Mr. Hensel, is a painstaking and brilliant inquiry into the moral quality of the acquisition, ownership, and transmission of property, from the standpoint of a Christian lawyer whose rare equipment for performing the service he has rendered is in evidence from start to finish of his discussion. Their personal acquaintance with the author, and their knowledge and admiration of his literary and legal attainments, will furnish most of the readers of *THE REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW* in advance with some idea of the force and eloquence that characterize his presentation of arguments in these pages. This "inquiry" of his bears many of the marks that belong to all great writing. It shows a command of broad and competent knowledge gathered from classic and scientific, historic and moral, realms. Its contentions move rapidly and logically along, keeping attention on the alert, invariably clothing themselves in language

that is at once plain and dignified, forceful and appropriate. It pleads its cause with the intense warmth and earnestness that are born of deep conviction, but at the same time with a self-restraint that leaves the impression that a great deal more could be said, and said with added emphasis, were it necessary to do so, to carry conviction. And its conclusions bear the impress of that "sweet reasonableness" which disarms opposition and wins assent to them.

Take an example in illustration, from a sentence or two quoted at random. "Labor is God's appointment; it is man's obligation; the material and forces of nature are his inheritance. Therefore, all wealth, or capital, or riches, as you may please to style, what one saves out of what he makes, above what he eats, is of divine origin." "Inherent in mankind and throughout all nature there is the tendency to acquire, increase, exercise, retain, and transmit material possessions. I believe this is sanctioned by God and the better experiences of man; that the tendency to despise and condemn it, and to promulgate the doctrine of communism, and to attack the rights of property, is as destructive of the interests of organized society as it is repugnant to every decent system of ethics or religion." "This reprobated tendency, it must be admitted, however, is not only the echo of a considerable amount of religious teaching, but a fair reflex of widely prevailing popular opinion and intense political effort. If on the one hand, there never has been an age of such colossal fortunes as the present, there certainly never has been a time when attacks upon property, wealth and contract were so venomous, so vicious and so popular."

Some of the mean things said about money, and the ease with which assault upon those who possess it can be excited, receive our author's attention. Preachers "wailing that we should take no thought for the morrow"; poets and lovers "breezily singing that even in the wilderness 'a Loaf, a Jug and Thou,' are quite enough"; philosophers with their lanterns, "finding no man honest whose house is bigger than

their tub," and political demagogues proclaiming that "the irrepressible issue between democracy and plutocracy is at last on, and that all men must now choose either to range themselves with the vicious 'classes' or take sides with the virtuous 'masses,'"—all these are given a hearing and the fallacy and dangerousness of their arguments and purposes pointed out and demolished. The entire community, rich and poor alike, ought to acknowledge the great indebtedness that is owing Mr. Hensel for the signal service he has so courageously rendered by his masterly advocacy of an unpopular cause,—the rich, for being justified in their rights of making, holding, and transmitting wealth and for being reminded of their responsibility to carry food to those that are hungry, light to those that are in darkness, life to those that are in death; the poor, for being warned against the enemies of social order and righteous progress, and for being told that their true friends are not those who would misuse and mislead them—who would incite them to discontent or move them to a sense of wrong—but rather the sympathetic heart, the benevolent hand, the sagacious brain of wealth conscious of its divine mission.

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND.

IX.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

"THE NEW THEOLOGY."*

The author of this volume has taken rank among the great English preachers of this generation. His ministry in the City Temple, London, bears testimony to his ability to preach the gospel and to win the hearts of men for Christ. No one questions his sincerity and his devotion to truth and righteousness. His voice has been heard on two continents and his words are read throughout the English-speaking world. One of his critics in the *British Weekly* says of him: "He has assuredly a magic power of attraction, such as is possessed by very few men. He has drawn multitudes to his ministry, and of these a large proportion have been touched by no other preacher." When a man of this kind, one whom the people trust and love, writes on theological questions, he will have a host of readers. His recognized leadership in the pulpit, no less than the contents of his book, will explain the fact that more than a hundred thousand copies were sold in a month and that translations have already appeared in several languages. The world is evidently still interested in God, eternity, and salvation. Men like Mr. Campbell, who are able to speak of the great mysteries of life in the simple language of the people, are not so much creators of thought as revealers of the hidden thoughts and intents of the heart. Different theological tendencies are brought to light and the undefined longings and aspirations of the common man are made manifest. For this reason, if for no other, we welcome "The New Theology."

* "The New Theology," by R. J. Campbell, M.A., Minister of the City Temple, London. Pages 258. Price \$1.50 net. The Macmillan Co., New York, 1907.

It was written, according to a statement in the introduction, "at the request of a number of my friends who feel that recent criticisms of what has come to be called the New Theology ought to be dealt with in some comprehensive and systematic way." In fourteen brief chapters, containing 253 pages, beginning with a statement of presuppositions and ending with the Church and the Kingdom of God, we have a popular presentation of Mr. Campbell's theology. The book may be called a cross between a doctrinal treatise and a sermon. The author evidently writes with his audience before him, and those who have read his sermons will at once recognize the preacher. One would not expect the style or even the method of a Schleiermacher or a Ritschl from Mr. Campbell. He does not write for scholars, nor is he lecturing before students of theology. He is speaking to the people of his parish, if not indeed of England and the Christian world generally. He has consequently been somewhat contemptuously treated by trained theologians. Dr. Fairbairn has termed the book a "farrago of nonsense." The editor of the *British Weekly* has called attention to the fact that Mr. Campbell "took his position in the Free Church ministry without any formal study of theology, that is, he never attended so far as we know any theological seminary. . . . His methods are all utterly inimical to exact thought, and so if he is misapprehended, he has himself to blame." Men of liberal tendencies, whom the author might have expected to agree with him, have expressed their dissent. Canon Hensley says: "I chiefly differ from Mr. Campbell because in my opinion he dangerously underestimates the fact of sin and the consequent need of atonement. My conviction is that if Christianity is to be a power in human life we must preach Christ Crucified." Some one wrote to Prof. Haeckel, the German scientist and philosopher, for a criticism of the book. The following reply was received by telegram: "I regret sickness, which keeps me from work, prevents me from writing about Mr. Campbell's so-called New Theology. Moreover, I regard it as useless from the gen-

uinely scientific standpoint to controvert theories which rest upon idealistic imaginativeness." While intense opposition has been aroused by the book, we must not forget that the followers of the author have organized theological associations for the propagation of his views. It seemed at first as if there was to be a line of cleavage between the old school and the new in the churches of England. To say the least a theological flurry in England and America followed the publication of the book, greater, indeed, than that which a generation ago came in the wake of "Robert Elsmere."

The popular style of the volume is not an unmixed good. Profound philosophical and theological questions are disposed of in a few paragraphs with an almost exasperating positiveness. The author knows how to use all the weapons of theological warfare. With complacency and with evident satisfaction he carves up orthodoxy and shelves it in the museum of antiquity. He covers his opponents with a thin veil of irony, sarcasm and ridicule. The sweeping statements, which are made, shake in a measure the reader's confidence in the thoroughness and the balance, though never in the honesty and goodness of the author. The book abounds in suggestive statements. Pregnant sentences and paragraphs are found on almost every page. The style is fascinating and the reader is captivated for once by a work on theology. Still we are compelled to differ at many points with the conclusions of the author.

The title of the book is "The New Theology." We prefer to call it "A New Theology." While we profess to be in sympathy with the effort to reconstruct Christian doctrine in the light of the new philosophy, the new criticism and the new science, we do not feel pledged to accept the conclusions of every one who calls himself a new theologian. There are as many types of new theology as there have been of old theology. We need but mention the works of Schleiermacher, of Ritschl, of Biedermann, of Sabatier, of Bushnell, and of Clarke, to realize the differences which exist between representatives of

the liberal school. True, there are certain characteristics common to all of them, but their differences are fully as great as those which divide the orthodox theologians. We consider Mr. Campbell's book an exposition of his conception of the new theology, but by no means an authoritative utterance to which all progressive theologians will yield assent. He is probably right when he says: "The New Theology cannot be a creed, but its adherents have a common standpoint." Yet it may be questioned whether its great exponents accept even his standpoint and much less the deductions which he draws from it.

If, as Mr. Balfour says, the decisive battles of theology are fought beyond its frontiers, then the criticism of the presuppositions or the basis of a theological system is most important. Mr. Campbell says the name "New Theology" "has long been in use both in this country and in America to indicate the attitude of those who believe that the fundamentals of the Christian faith need to be rearticulated in terms of the immanence of God. They do not believe that there is any need for a new religion, but that the forms in which the religion of Jesus is commonly presented are inadequate and misleading." The doctrine of divine immanence he does not regard as new, but it has been suffered to fall in the background. "In the immediate past the doctrine of the divine transcendence—that is, the obvious truth that the infinite being of God must transcend the finite universe—has been presented in such a way as to amount to practical dualism." The latter view, he thinks, leads to a hopeless separation of God and the world. "The philosophy underlying the New Testament" the author declares to be "monistic idealism." Without proving his declaration he proceeds to expound Christian doctrine in the light of his philosophy. The result of his work is about as much a philosophy into which the facts of Christianity are fitted, as a theology constructed from the data of Christian revelation.

Now we do not deny that there are scholars in Europe and

America who are striving to "rearticulate" "the fundamentals of Christian faith." But it is not so clear that the rearticulation is generally attempted "in terms of the immanence of God." On the guiding principle of reconstruction the new theologians differ. While the immanence of God is emphasized by all, it is not made the formative principle of every new theology. To do so would be to limit again the Christian revelation to the scope of "our little systems" and to bind it with the very bonds from which men hope to deliver it.

In an article on "Theological Reconstruction" Dr. McGiffert has made the following illuminating statement: "The trouble with most of the historic theologies is that they have not been based upon the life and work of Jesus; and they have been, in fact, almost everything else but genuinely Christian theologies. In the system of the Alexandrine theologians the eternal Logos, not the historic figure of Jesus Christ, had the place of prominence; in the system of Augustine the two-fold conception of God as the alone source of good and as absolute will was dominant, and Jesus Christ was quite unnecessary; to the medieval theologians only his relation to the sacramental system and to the treasury of merit was important; to Calvin the sovereign decree of God was the constructive principle, and the figure of Jesus occupied a subsidiary place. And so in more recent days we have had theological reconstructions based upon the conception of the church as the perpetual incarnation, the mystical body of the Son of God; upon the doctrine of the divine immanence; upon the theory of evolution; and most recently of all upon the principle of personality. We have had plenty of reconstructions upon all sorts of bases, but upon the basis of Jesus Christ's revelation we have had a very few." We quote at some length to illustrate in the briefest way how Mr. Campbell's principle of reconstruction—the divine immanence—is only one of many that have been applied in the last century. It is a too sweeping and a misleading statement to say that the new theology aims to rear-

ticulate the Christian faith "in terms of the immanence of God."

It is our conviction that we need a reconstruction in terms neither of an old nor of a new philosophy, but in the social, personal, and concrete language of Jesus. He and His revelation are the formative principle of Christian theology. Neither Platonism nor Darwinism, dualism nor monism is a satisfactory background for the revelation of Jesus. When we translate the terms of fatherhood, sonship, and brotherhood into the language of philosophy, we deal with abstractions, from which Jesus came to deliver us and which the Christian consciousness can never comprehend. We do not think that the author helps to solve difficulties in the modern mind by trying to revive what he believes to be a pre-Christian view of the world. He says: "What I have to say leads back through Hegelianism to the old Greek thinkers, and beyond them again to the wise men who lived and taught in the East ages before Jesus was born. It is that this finite universe of ours is one means of the self-realization of the infinite." This may be true or not. But we are inclined to question the theory that the philosophic presuppositions for a Christian theology in the twentieth century are to be got from the "wise men who lived and taught in the East ages before Jesus was born." We prefer to find the Christian Weltanschauung in the revelation of Jesus rather than in a philosophy new or old.

Mr. Campbell does not seem to have laid hold of the significance of the Christological principle in theology. He makes statements which point in that direction, but the general tenor of the book shows that he is far more under the influence of a philosophy than of the teachings of the gospels. One is ready to assent to a sentence like this: "And creeds or no creeds, we hold that the religious experience which came to the world in Jesus of Nazareth is enough for all our needs and only requires to be freed from the limiting statements in order to lay firm hold once more upon the civilized world." At another

place he says: "Jesus becomes my gateway to the innermost of God. When I look at Him I say to myself, God is that, and, if I can only get down to the truth about myself, I shall find that I am that too." Barring the last clause, expressions like these lead one to expect a Christological interpretation of God. But in the next breath he makes assertions which plainly show that he in no way sees God through Jesus, but makes Jesus speak of God in the language of philosophy. He goes back to the ancient sages and gets from them the clarifying proposition "that the finite universe of ours is one means to the self-realization of the infinite." Or, "God is the infinite consciousness." Or, "Thus we get two modes of God, the infinite, perfect, unconditioned, primordial being; and the finite, imperfect, conditional, and limited being of which we are ourselves expression." These are doubtless good philosophical definitions of God, but do they "free the religious experience which came to the world in Jesus of Nazareth" "from limiting statements?" In steering clear of the Scylla of the ancient dogmatists is he not drawn into the Charybdis of a modern philosophy?

In Jesus we find God as Father, as holy love. Men are living in filial fellowship with the heavenly Father and in fraternal relations to one another. For religious purposes, for the formulation of the contents of the distinctively Christian consciousness, for a view of the world corresponding to the revelation of Jesus and the faith of the Christian, we must base our theology not on the colorless intellectual concepts of philosophy but on the living, breathing and universally experienced terms describing the family relationships in which Jesus Himself spoke of God, man and the world. We think of Jesus as of God and of God as of Jesus. The position held by this REVIEW on this point is ably presented by a former editor, Dr. Rupp, in an article on "The Definition of the Christological Principle," *REFORMED QUARTERLY*, 1891, p. 46: "By the Christological principle we understand the idea of an eternal union of God and man in the person

of Christ, as the medium of God's perfect self-communication and self-revelation to the world, and the consummation of all his ways and works. This implies, on the one hand, that Christ is the principle of the divine constitution of the world, and that in Him as St. Paul says, all things consist or hold together. He is not an accident or an afterthought in the divine world plan, but its central and determinative idea, the vital root as well as culminating head of all things. It implies, on the other hand, that Christ is the principle of all sound knowledge of God and of His ways and works. We can only know God aright in the light and inspiration of Christ. It follows then that the conception of love must be the determinative principle in any true or Christian doctrine of God. No doctrine of God would be Christian at all that is ruled by any other conception; as, for instance, the conception of sovereignty, of honor, or of glory."

When we come to consider the specific doctrines of God, Sin, Jesus Christ, the Atonement, etc., we do not forget that it is difficult to do justice to the author in quoting a sentence here and there. On account of the popular and somewhat inexact way of treatment, it is comparatively easy to cull assertions in favor of orthodoxy and heterodoxy, according to the purpose of the critic. Only a perusal of the chapters themselves will satisfy the discriminating reader. He says, for example, "I believe what the creeds say about the person of Jesus, but I believe it in a way that puts no gulf between Him and the rest of the human race." He does not deny that Jesus was "of one substance with the Father," but he would affirm the same fact of all mankind. "I start with the assumption that the universe is God's thought about Himself, and that in so far as I am able to think it along with Him, 'I and my Father (even metaphysically speaking) are one.'" So much to show how he uses the old formulas and puts into them a content in agreement with his philosophy.

In the space left us we shall allude briefly to some of his leading doctrines. His view of God, as we have already

hinted, is not taken from the revelation of Jesus. It is a philosophical concept. He contrasts it, not without a touch of irreverence for which he asks pardon, with the ordinary church-going Christian's talk about God, which he describes as follows: "They talk as though He were (practically) a finite being stationed somewhere above and beyond the universe, watching and worrying over other and lesser finite beings, to wit, ourselves. According to the received phraseology this God is greatly bothered and thwarted by what men have been doing throughout the few milleniums of human existence. He takes the whole thing very seriously and thinks about little else than getting wayward humanity into line again. To this end He has adopted various expedients, the chief of which was the sending of His only begotten Son to suffer and die in order that He might be free to forgive the trouble we had caused Him." Such a theology "narrows religion and belittles God." However faulty this conception of God and its characterization may be, it seems to us to be far more nearly that of the prophets, apostles and Christ than the abstractions of Mr. Campbell. The new science or philosophy certainly does not compel us to abandon the belief that God is "watching and worrying over other and lesser finite beings" and that He is "greatly bothered and thwarted by what men have been doing throughout the few milleniums of human existence." If that is a piece of outlived superstition then the function of religion is gone. Jesus teaches us that God "takes the whole thing very seriously" and that "He sent His only begotten Son to suffer and to die." Eliminate these elements from the Gospel and you have practically destroyed the message. The parable of the Prodigal Son will inevitably make the impression that "God is greatly bothered and thwarted" by men. That "He is watching and worrying over other and lesser finite beings" seems to be undeniably implied in the words, "Are not two sparrows sold for a penny? and not one of them shall fall to the ground without your Father: but the very hairs of your head are all numbered.

Fear not therefore; ye are of more value than many sparrows." The systems of men may have failed to give adequate expression to God's relation to the world and to the fact of providence. This great mystery defies the power of human thought and language; men have a right to seek new forms for it. But for the purpose of religion we fail to find a more satisfactory definition than the one which is attacked in "The New Theology," and that which is offered as a substitute seems to be about as far from the biblical as from the traditional orthodox view.

The author rightly says: "The great question for religion in the immediate future is that of the person of Jesus and the sooner we address ourselves to it the better." Many excellent things are said about Jesus. He points out His superiority over other founders of religion. He affirms His uniqueness among men. "If all the theologians and materialists put together were to set to work to-morrow to try to show that Jesus was just like other people, they would not succeed, for the civilized world has already made up its mind on that point, and by a right instinct recognizes Jesus as the unique standard of human excellence." In reply to the charge that he makes Him only a man, he says, "I make Him the only man—and there is a difference. We have only seen perfect manhood once and that was the manhood of Jesus." He denies that he is a Unitarian. For he does "believe that Jesus is very God." The distinction, which he makes, between his position and that of the traditional orthodoxy is that the latter would restrict the description "God manifest in the flesh" to Jesus alone; the New Theology would extend it in a lesser degree to all humanity, and would maintain that in the end it will be as true of every individual soul as ever it was of Jesus.

It is evident from this assertion that the difference between Jesus and men is merely a difference of attainment. All men are God as Jesus is God. God is only a form of humanity and humanity is a form of deity. But the essential difference between God and man or Christ and man is a base-

less assumption of a dualistic view of the world. Here, too, we feel that the author's position is untenable. We need not indeed bind ourselves to the phraseology of Greek and Latin theologians or to the inscrutable formulas of the Chalcedonian creed, and still hold to an essential difference between Christ and men. The author's statement, "until we come to creed making, we never think of putting Him (Jesus) on the God side of things and ourselves on the other," does not accord with facts. Long before the disciples thought of creeds they thought of Jesus as of God. Creeds are the product of the conviction in men that Jesus belonged to the divine rather than the human sphere. Those who taught that Jesus was merely a man have been in a hopeless minority from the first century on. So overpowering was the impression, which Jesus made on His followers, that the tendency has been to so elevate Him above men as to lose sight of His humanity. If we may appeal to Christian instinct, as the author himself does, we find a strong argument for a distinction, based on a difference, between Christ and His followers. He will remain Lord and Saviour forever. In that respect we shall not become like Him. Not one of the redeemed in eternity will be able to make his own the sayings of Jesus, as for example, "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest"; or, "All things have been delivered unto me of my Father: and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him." What the essential difference between Him and men is we shall perhaps never understand, but the historical picture of Him in the gospels, the experience of Christians for twenty centuries, and the most searching investigation of His words and deeds do not shake the primitive belief that God is in Christ and that between Him and men there is that indefinable difference and unbridgable gulf which is constantly implied in the two basal monosyllables God and man. The giving up of this difference would doubtless lead to such a

reconstruction of Christianity as to turn it into a philosophical system with an exalted ethics, while it would cease to be a religion of redemption.

The virgin birth is frankly denied. "A supernatural conception bears no relation whatever to the moral and spiritual worth of the person who is supposed to enter the world in this abnormal way." The author goes so far as to say that "it operates as a hindrance to spiritual religion and a real living faith in Jesus." It is doubtless true that the church has unduly emphasized the virgin birth as the central proof of the deity of Jesus. Without regard to the significance of the doctrine in the ancient church men are fanatically declaiming against those who have any doubts on the manner of Christ's birth. We have no sympathy with such a procedure. Yet we are equally convinced that no one can positively deny the virgin birth. On that point, as some one suggests, the scientist Huxley would have said that it was improbable, but not that it was untrue. The unique life of Jesus, which no one will gainsay, makes it altogether probable that He had a unique origin. The theory of a virgin birth may be far more satisfactory for the explanation of the Christ life than any other hypothesis. It is a grievous error, however, for the church to proclaim the virgin birth as an infallible dogma which men must accept in order to be truly Christian and with the denial of which Christianity must fall. While we could not deny the doctrine, we should never impose it as a dogma upon the believer. The author by his denial of the virgin birth commits the same error as those who positively affirm it. For the believer the manner of the conception and birth of Christ must always be an inference from the spiritual and ethical quality of His life rather than a fixed and unchangeable dogma delivered from the throne.

Mr. Campbell, also, holds the doctrine of universal salvation. It is a natural conclusion of his philosophy. He says: "A man may go on living for self all through a long career; he may bury his better nature deep underneath the hard shell

of materialism and self-indulgence, but all in vain; sooner or later, on this side of death or on the other, that buried life shall rise in power and all barriers be swept away." Here again he speaks with unwarranted positiveness on a question which ought not to be dogmatically answered one way or another. Men may cherish the larger hope. But it is contrary to the scientific spirit of the new theology to speak with unerring authority on the origin and the end of things or of men. These are wrapped in mystery and may never be explained. We must confine ourselves to the revelation of God in history and not attempt to unveil the secrets of pre-existence and post-existence. In passing these limits the old theology went beyond its scope. One of the first principles of the new theology is to abide in the sphere of the historical, and not to enter into the realms of the metaphysical and speculative.

The reader will find an original and suggestive treatment of the atonement, which is also colored by the monism of the author. The chapter on the authority of the Bible is one of the most satisfactory in the book. The discussion on the relation of the church to the kingdom is clarifying and helpful.

The defect of the book is not in its style or in one or the other chapter. Many fine passages are found from beginning to end. Many statements are made to which one yields assent. But the standpoint and method of the author we regard as misleading. He fails in not making the revelation of Jesus the basis of his theology. He substitutes a philosophy which, like all philosophies before this age, conceals rather than reveals the truth of the gospel.

G. W. R.

X.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

SOCIAL AND RELIGIOUS IDEALS. By the Rev. Artemus Jean Haynes, M.A. Cloth. Pages 168. Price \$1.00 net. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907.

The radical and far-reaching changes which are taking place in theological conceptions, throw many thoughtful people into serious perplexity. To such, the contents of this little volume are addressed by the author in the hope of affording them reassurance and guidance. One welcomes the candid acknowledgment made in the preface, that "the essays were written from the point of view of one who frankly accepts the established facts of modern science and the new Biblical criticism, of one who is in full sympathy with that movement of religious life which is now finding its interpretation in what is known as the New Theology." Whilst approved by the reasoning intellect, this theology, the writer acknowledges, has yet to justify itself to the spirit of man, and so his appeal is not primarily to dogma but to life. This appeal is felt and responded to very often as one reads the crisp and well-written chapters, whose fault is not in their brevity and freshness, but in their fragmentary and disconnected character. Ordinarily in reading books one is led onward from chapter to chapter, that which precedes preparing the mind for what is to follow. In the present instance such is not the case. Rich and valuable in truth and suggestiveness as the discussion of one topic may be, the connection with what has gone before or follows after, is generally too remote to be discoverable. Perhaps one would lose nothing of the real instruction and helpfulness of the book, if the chapters were read in the reverse order of their appearance, or for that matter in any order. If this is a defect, it does not seriously interfere with one's enjoyment of the volume, nor impair the valuable service it is calculated to render. To be able to compress no less than 166 chapters, many of which are gems in form and method of applying the principles of Jesus to individual and social life and of establishing a just balance between personal and social values, is itself a distinct achievement. This has been accomplished by Mr. Haynes.

A. S. WEBER.

PRAGMATISM,—A NEW NAME FOR SOME OLD WAYS OF THINKING. By William James. Cloth. Crown 8vo. Pages 310. Price \$1.25 net. New York, Longmans Green and Co., 1907.

In this volume the author of "The Varieties of Religious Experience" adds another contribution to his already large list of

philosophical treatises. The book contains the Lowell Institute Lectures for the current year, in the form in which they were delivered last December and January. Professor James does not altogether like the name Pragmatism, but the movement in thought which is taking place under the name, he thinks, has already made too much progress to leave it possible now to change it. Those interested in this philosophical movement will be very grateful to this brilliant and able scholar for bringing out into one picture the various tendencies and interpretations of philosophy as now held under this particular name of Pragmatism.

The eight lectures cover a wide range of knowledge and inquiry. After an introductory chapter, on the present dilemma in philosophy, the second is devoted to the stating of what Pragmatism means. It is a method and a theory,—a method under the application of which disputed questions may be brought to a settlement; a theory of truth, the equivalent of humanism, through whose mediation empiricism and religion may be reconciled, and the stress of discussions “unstiffened.” Pragmatism, the author says, unstiffens our opposition everywhere, and should help to reconcile contending theories of thought and life. In subsequent lectures he illustrates and enforces these claims by applying the Pragmatic theory to a number of the long-existing problems in philosophy. Its value appears in helping us in our search not only of unity but of totality also, and in showing that monistic dogmatism must be rejected, and the findings of empiricism followed. In the chapter on Pragmatism and Common Sense, he suggests that the source of the latter may lie in the unrecorded discoveries of pre-historic thinkers; and in that Pragmatism’s Conception of Truth shows the bankruptcy to which rationalism has been brought by its method of dealing with the subject, and the far more satisfying conclusions of the Pragmatists. In the several remaining chapters the relations of the new-named philosophy to humanism and religion are dealt with, and results indicated that are very interesting even though they may not be entirely satisfactory. The book will doubtless add new fuel to the controversial fires which are at present raging in philosophical journals over the theory of Pragmatism as advocated by Professor Dewey at the Chicago University. Those interested in that discussion, as well as others of philosophical mental bent, will want to read these lectures on the Lowell foundation.

A. S. WEBER.

THE IDEAS THAT HAVE INFLUENCED CIVILIZATION IN THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS. Oliver J. Thatcher, Ph.D., Department of History, University of Chicago, Editor. Ten volumes. Each volume about 410 pages. Grand de Luxe Edition, limited to 1,000 complete sets. University Research Extension, Auditorium Building, Chicago.

The purpose of this monumental work is clearly defined by the editor in the preface. "The work embraces the religious beliefs of the past, as expressed and enforced by the seers who have given them to the world; the theories of philosophy in the expositions of their originators; the marvelous discoveries and inductions of the natural sciences as expounded by the men who have first seen the truths beneath the facts; the development of the social sciences and of law, government, education, and industry in the monographs which have championed their principles, and the documents which have exhibited their practices and, finally, the great movements which have made manifest the pulse beat of the ages, as they have been caught and held living in the kinetograph-like records of the best contemporary observers." No one will deny that the editor set before him a gigantic task which few men would undertake to perform. The reviewer, after a cursory examination of the form, plan and contents of the volumes, may to some extent be able to tell how nearly the purpose of the compiler has been realized.

The paper, binding, and illustrations are a thing of beauty and a joy to the reader. The mechanical structure is commensurate with the import of the contents. The material is grouped under four main topics—Religion, Philosophy, Social Sciences (including economics, political science, institutions, laws, education), Natural Sciences. The chronological limits are the earliest historical records, 4,000 B. C. and the twentieth century. Documents of every ancient and modern civilized nation are cited in chronological order, many of them at length, to illustrate the history and significance of the several topics. The first volume, for example, takes up the earliest religious ideas, notably of Assyria—Babylonia, Egypt, the Jews, the Brahmins, the Buddhists, Zoroaster, and Confucius. Brief introductions and biographies introduce the reader to the quoted source. In this way each document is given its historical setting. The abstracts are well chosen and of sufficient length to give an intelligent idea of the subject discussed. The translations are made by specialists in the several departments and are as reliable as translations can be. On Egypt 50 pages from the Book of the Dead and 24 pages from the observations of Herodotus are given. Over 100 pages are devoted to Brahmanic literature, and 103 to Buddhist ideas. The collation of sources on the early religions is itself suggestive and one can make a profitable comparative study of religious beliefs from the material of the first volume.

The student is naturally interested in Greece and Rome. The second and third volumes contain the material on these nations. Fifty-two pages are given to Greek religion, 50 to Greek institutions (Aristotle on the Athenian Constitution, and Lycurgus on Spartan laws); the remaining 300 pages contain extensive excerpts from the early Greek thinkers, from Plato (120 pages), Diogenes, Aristotle (74 pages), Zeno and Epicurus. In the volume on Rome 100 pages are given to abstracts on the Development of the Roman Law and Constitution. It would be hard to find so much valuable material in a single volume. In fact, one would have to ransack a library and then, unless he is a specialist, he would probably not find half the matter that is here so conveniently offered.

The volumes treating the modern period are no less interesting than those on the ancient world. Volume VIII. has 270 pages on the Development of Political Ideas in the U. S., which is supplemented by 166 pages on the same subject in Volume IX. One hundred and thirty-one pages are given to the subject of Evolution, in which the history and the meaning of the theory are defined by quotations from its leading expounders from Lyell to Haeckel. Another interesting topic is the history and ideals of education which can be traced from the earliest times to the present day. Copious abstracts on pedagogy are taken from Greek and Latin authors, and especially from the famous educators of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

We have at some length referred to the space given to the several departments in order to show that the volumes are not made up of scraps but contain sufficient material for an intelligent study from the sources. We find also that the selections are carefully and pertinently made. This could be done on so large a variety of subjects and in so extensive a period, as the editor himself recognizes, only by the aid of trained specialists. From the names of scholars, who took part in the preparation of the volumes, one can see that the editor was wise in the selection of his collaborators and had the assistance of the greatest living authorities. The work is, therefore, not a hasty compilation ordered by a publishing house for the sake of increasing dividends. It is a dignified and masterly production which does honor to the editor and the University which he represents.

It is not a cyclopedia, nor a historian's history of the world, nor selections from the best authors in all ages. These works have their place. It is a history of the growth of civilization set forth in "those documents in which the world thinkers have embodied the ideas and discoveries which have given man control over nature and himself, and by linking them together in practically chronological order with introductions and biographies,

we have made a history, the student of which may, so to speak, begin to live five thousand years ago and think and feel what man has thought and felt down the ages." The trained scholar will prefer the original sources to a translation. But the average student will find in this work what he wants,—access to the best English translations of the historic literature of all nations, which are not loosely thrown together but arranged according to a definite historical plan.

We recommend these volumes especially to libraries of high schools, colleges, and theological seminaries. Those who can procure them for their private libraries will find them equally as helpful, if not more so, as the encyclopedia. For the price of the work communicate with the publishers.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.

THE STANDARD SCHOOL LIBRARY.

THE GROWTH OF THE AMERICAN NATION. By Harry Pratt Judson, LL.D., Head Professor of Political Science in the University of Chicago. Pages 270. Price 50 cents.

LIFE HISTORIES OF AMERICAN INSECTS. By Clarence Moores Weed, D.Sc., Professor of Zoology and Entomology, New Hampshire College of Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts. Pages 270. Price 50 cents.

THE STORY OF THE ILIAD. By The Rev. Alfred J. Church, M.A., Lately Professor of Latin in University College, London. Pages 314. Price 50 cents. New York, The Macmillan Co., 66 Fifth Avenue.

As the name implies the volumes of the Standard School Library are prepared with special reference to the needs of the youth in schools and of the intelligent lay reader. The subjects are taken from the sphere of science, history, biography, classical literature, fiction, and sociology. The catalogue contains a list of sixty volumes; the number, however, is increasing annually. The authors are specialists in the departments on which they write, which gives the books, not only a clear and concise style, but a trustworthy authority. The volumes are sold at fifty cents, cloth, and may be procured either singly or in sets. Judging from the copies we have examined, the whole library deserves the careful attention of all persons who are in search of instructive reading, either for themselves or for the youth in their charge. From the variety of topics treated, one will find no difficulty in selecting at least some volumes for his personal perusal or for use in the library of the home, the school, or the town.

We shall briefly review the three books of the series which have been submitted to us.

The Growth of the American Nation by Dr. Judson is a model book both in its mechanical structure and in its contents. It seems almost impossible that a book so well bound, printed in such clear type and on heavy paper, with carefully prepared maps,

illustrations, and an index, could be sold at so low a price. But still more satisfactory is the method of treatment of the subject and the style of composition. In the allotted space the author necessarily had to omit details in the history of the American nation. Nor was it his purpose to write a history or even a historical outline. He attempts to state the cardinal facts in the history in such a way as to show the orderly development in our national life. He follows the topical plan in the arrangement of the material.

The six parts, containing 27 brief chapters, are designated as follows: I. Explorers and Colonists; II. the Colonies Become a Nation; III. The Dominance of Foreign Relations; IV. The Epoch of Peace and Social Progress; V. Slavery and State Rights; VI. The Indestructible Union of Indestructible States. At the head of each chapter the leading references for further reading are given. The maps and illustrations throw light on the narrative. Nothing seems to be wanting to make the page attractive and the book useful and readable.

In a remarkable way the author has succeeded in presenting clearly, concisely, and logically the factors and forces which have entered into the making of the nation. Books of this class often are too vague and general to be interesting, but there is a vivacity and concreteness in this volume which holds the attention of the reader, and above all makes him pause and reflect with delight upon the statements made. It is not our purpose to quote paragraphs but one could find sentences pregnant with ideas and seed thoughts on almost every page, which none but a master of his subject could have written. The spirit of the writer is that of one who calmly weighs his facts and seeks to draw his inferences without fear or favor.

The book will naturally commend itself to the general reader and probably will be no less enjoyed by the scientific scholar.

Life Histories of American Insects contains 21 full-page plates and many figures in the text. These illustrations are indispensable in a book on this subject. They are clearly printed and help the reader to follow intelligently the descriptions in the text.

In the preface the author says: "In the following pages I have attempted to discuss in a non-technical manner the life histories of a few of the most interesting American insects. Many of these are species or groups of species which I have especially studied during the last ten years; but in the case of nearly all the sketches I have drawn freely for facts upon the published writings of my fellow-entomologists."

Having read some of the chapters, not as a scientist but as a layman who sought information and instruction, we have found all that we sought for. In popular style the origin, names, locali-

ties and habits of the several insects are set forth. A neglected world of life is brought to light, of which the great mass of people remains ignorant. Even the college graduate of thirty years ago got only a faint intimation of this realm of being.

Now the boy may read the story of insects with as much interest as a novel or a biography. Books like these will awaken interest in the world about us and will stimulate thought which will save men from becoming mere machines which consume so much fuel daily, must do so much work in so many hours, and earn so much money in so many years. One might write an essay on the ethical value of an interest in bugs. The child in whom it is aroused will have a new affection which will expel more than one dangerous tendency or vicious inclination.

Prof. Church has performed a valuable service for the young in his preparation of the *Story of the Iliad* in the form of a chaste and attractive prose narrative. In point of interest one cannot find more desirable and certainly not more instructive stories than those of the Hebrew, Greek and Latin classics. If they are read in childhood they become a part of the mental equipment and enter into the intellectual and moral life of a man as food does of the bone and muscle of the body. By actual experiment we have found that a normal boy or girl from eight years upward will read and re-read the *Iliad*, *Odyssey*, and Greek mythology generally, in story form, with the greatest delight. Question such a boy on ancient mythology and you will find him to have it at his fingers' ends. Otherwise he will probably remain ignorant of the great myths even though he later gets his B.A. degree.

An intelligent reader of this volume enclosed a note in it with the following: "Amid the abundance of books, we will not say literature, tempting the young we may appreciate and be thankful for such a treasure. Since the ideal is the only true and real the tales which take our youth from the real life of this prosaic and commercial age are of infinite value. Well is it for the Republic that each generation loves the old, old tales and fondly reads or listens to their recital but each repetition must be faithful. Young critics are very keen, therefore we say, give your boy Church's *Story of the Iliad*."

The cry for substantial literature, the desire to quicken in men a sense for the true, beautiful and good in life, the effort to lift men above the dull routine of a materialistic age into an appreciation of the invisible and eternal realities, is at least partially met by the publications of the Standard School Library.

G. W. RICHARDS.

A HEBREW AND ENGLISH LEXICON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT with an appendix containing the Biblical Aramaic based on the lexicon of William Gesenius as translated by Edward Robinson, late professor in the Union Theological Seminary, New York, by Francis Brown, D.D., D.Litt., Davenport Professor of Hebrew and the Cognate Languages in the Union Theological Seminary, with the coöperation of S. R. Driver, D.D., Litt.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, and Charles A. Briggs, D.D., D.Litt., Edward Robinson, Professor of Biblical Theology in the Union Theological Seminary. Boston, New York, and Chicago. Houghton, Mifflin and Company. The Riverside Press, Cambridge, 1906. Price \$7.50 net. See page 307.

THE RELIGIOUS CONCEPTION OF THE WORLD: An Essay in Constructive Philosophy, by Arthur Kenyon Rogers, Ph.D., Professor in Butler College; Author of "A Brief Introduction to Modern Philosophy," and "A Students' History of Philosophy." Published by the Macmillan Company, New York, 1907. Price \$1.50 net.

As the title indicates this is a work in the department of philosophy. It is a book of 284 pages, printed in nice clear type and written in dignified philosophical language. The writer is logical in the treatment of his subject and a close reasoner. In order to appreciate the book the reader needs a philosophical cast of mind and pay attention to every page and sentence as he reads.

In addition to an introduction the author discusses the following topics in so many chapters: The Foundation of Knowledge; The Validity of Knowledge; Religion and Philosophy; The Argument of Purpose; The Relation of God and Nature; The Relation of God and Man; The Nature of God; The Problem of Freedom; The Problem of Evil; The Problem of Immortality. The purpose of the book is stated by the author in the opening sentences as follows: "I propose in the following pages to defend a view of the world which is frankly religious and theistic, in opposition to certain modern types of philosophical thought which are now widely prevalent. The results which I shall advocate do not therefore depart very far from the presuppositions which underlie the ordinary Christian consciousness when these are interpreted, not in a dogmatic, but in a broadly philosophical way." To our mind he accomplishes the task thus set before himself very well. He presents to the reader a safe and sane discussion of his subject. We will not undertake to give the readers of the REVIEW any outline of Dr. Rogers' views, but we will give a few quotations from his introduction in order to show some of his ideas and his mode of expressing himself. "No man can philosophize rightly who has no personal concern in the common hopes and fears and ideals and beliefs of men, and the profession of this is either an affectation or a limitation. If the philosopher stood apart from his race and were thinking out a merely private scheme of life for himself it might be tolerated in him. But he is doing nothing of the sort. It is the expe-

rience of man on which he is building." The author does not deny the value and necessity of logic, but he does not agree that logic in itself determines the truth of any proposition. Logic must be tested by experience. Hence he says, "The fact that a conclusion which is repugnant to the natural sense of mankind has a strictly logical justification, instead of proving the truth of this opinion, only serves to call out the recognition that premises leading to such a result must be one-sided, and so sends men back to a wider experience to correct them."

Governed by the above conceptions the author treats the series of topics of his book. He is well acquainted with modern scientific and philosophical thought; but he quotes no authorities and does not specially discuss the views of other particular persons. He goes straight forward in a positive way, building up, illustrating and defending his own conceptions. It is quite refreshing to meet with an author occasionally who is not continually turning aside to pay his respects, favorably or unfavorably, to this, that or the other writer on the same general subject. In this case there is less show of learning but greater value for the ordinary readers of such a book. Whether the author's conceptions can in every particular be maintained or not we have in his production an unmistakable evidence that a philosophy of the world can be evolved, given in full recognition to all modern discoveries of science, that is neither atheistic nor deistic but thoroughly theistic. This is a book that can be read and studied with profit.

A. E. TRUXALL.

THE STEPS OF LIFE, Further Essays on Happiness. By Carl Hilty, Professor of Constitutional Law in the University of Bern, translated by Rev. Melvin Brandow, of Lancaster, Pa., with a brief introduction by Dr. Francis G. Peabody, of Harvard. Published by The Macmillan Co., New York. Price \$1.25 net.

This is the second volume on the same general subject published by Professor Hilty. Like the former it consists of a number of dissertations on various subjects; but they all have in view, directly or indirectly, the happiness of man. The following eight topics are treated in this volume: Sin and Sorrow; "Comfort ye my people;" On the Knowledge of Men; What is Culture? Noble Souls; Transcendental Hope; The Prolegomena of Christianity; and The Steps of Life. There are 264 pages in the book.

There are a few things, besides the inherent merits of the book, that make it interesting. First, the author is not a trained theologian, but a layman whose calling is in another sphere entirely. Dr. Peabody tells us that "the studies of life which these volumes represent are the products of his leisure hours." The second feature of these writings which add to their interest is the fact

that they are in a considerable measure the expression of his own personal experience. Whenever a learned man writes out of his heart, rather than out of his mind, then are we disposed to pay close attention to his utterances. In reading the book one cannot help but feel that these chapters are the expressions of his experience of life, and the operations of his mind under his varied experiences. We are told in the introduction that these subjects were "wrought out of his meditation and experience." We suspect the facts in the case would be more accurately expressed by a reversal of the terms meditation and experience.

The teaching of the book is sane and healthy, serious and earnest throughout, and is profitable reading. It is well to remember, however, that the author is a European and lives in Switzerland. Some of his expressions and criticisms would no doubt be modified somewhat and given a different coloring if he had been reared in the American church. Nevertheless the book is a valuable contribution to Christian literature and will be very profitable to the thoughtful reader. There is good sound practical philosophy in every chapter. In order to give the readers of this notice some idea of the fundamental conceptions of the author and his mode of expressing them we here give two extracts from the first chapter. "Duty and sin," he says on page 6, "become wholly intelligible only when we recognize a personal, extramundane God from whose will this inner law proceeds; while the so-called 'immanence' of God is but another name for atheism or pantheism. To be sure, it would be idle to desire a reasoned explanation of the transcendental God; everything transcendental by its very nature escapes our comprehension, and for this reason the so-called 'proofs' of the existence of God have no power to convince the human understanding. Nor do they seem ever to have convinced any one who did not first want to be."

The above is evidence that Professor Hilty holds firmly to a transcendental God, and that is good. But to believe in the immanence of God to his mind is to let go of His personal transcendence. But many great and good minds believe both facts to be true. God is both transcendent and immanent. These things cannot be proven or clearly and comprehensively explained to the understanding. But when we believe in the transcendence of a personal God we must nevertheless recognize that He sustains some relation to the world and works in it. And then the question arises, How? We believe that both in the physical, intellectual and moral spheres God works from within out, and not upon them from without. And here is where the divine immanence comes in. Professor Hilty gives intimations throughout his book that his conception of God's operations in the world are not entirely of an outward mechanical nature. Of course the

doctrine of the immanence of God is confronted by some difficulties. There are some things in it that cannot be reconciled to the logical reason. But the proposition that the Lord as a personal, transcendental God rules the world by working upon it from without raises many more and greater difficulties for the reason.

On page 21 we find the following: "It is certain that there is a way of release from continuous sorrow; it must be just as certain that single and even frequent sorrow belong to the necessary events of our life. *There can be no human life without sorrows; but to live with sorrow, yes, with many sorrows, yet free from sorrow's burden, that is the art of life toward which we are being trained.* It is, therefore, an every day experience that men who have too few sorrows buy themselves some; for riches, which in the view of most men are meant to release one from anxiety, are not fitted to do that; they are 'deceitfulness,' as Christ calls them, and his warnings against them, which we are wont to take so lightly, are surely not there for merely 'decorative effect.'" The italics in the above quotation are ours. No fault can be found with such teaching. The author's analysis of human life under all its phases and activities and experiences is very good and instructive. The entire book is helpful and uplifting. Only here and there exception may be taken to the writer's theological conceptions, philosophical theories and ideas of the Christian life. We very much enjoyed reading this volume.

SERMONS OF A BUDDHIST ABBOTT. By Soyen Shaku. Pages 220. Open Court Publishing Co., Chicago.

This is a unique book. The main part of it consists of a series of sermons delivered by a Buddhist priest before American audiences. The author of the sermons represented the Buddhist faith in Japan at the Parliament of Religions of the Chicago Exposition, in 1893, where he read papers on "The Law of Cause and Effect as Taught by Buddha" and on "Arbitration Instead of War." In 1906 he made a second visit to America, in connection with which he delivered his sermons, mainly to audiences in California.

The sermons are of great value in presenting to English readers in attractive and readable form the teachings of Buddhism as now held in a nation so intelligent as Japan; and they contain much that will deepen the respect of a fair-minded man for this ancient and widespread religion of the East.

Under the topic "Spiritual Enlightenment" the sermons treat of what may be called the epistemology of Buddhism. Religious knowledge comes through "enlightenment," and enlightenment is defined as "a man's becoming conscious through personal expe-

rience of the ultimate nature of his inner being." It is direct empirical perception. The light of religious truth breaks in upon the consciousness and emancipates it. The words used in drawing the distinction between religion and philosophy are interesting: "Religion wants to see and not to demonstrate; to grasp directly with her own hands and not rely upon a medium; to see intuitively and not discursively. What is therefore asked for by a religious spirit is fact and not representation, enlightenment and not reflection; and this will be supplied by no amount of speculation and imagination." This is good, and not much at variance with the prevailing trend of Christian theological thought since the time of Schleiermacher. Yet how inadequate man's power of religious perception is unless met by the revelation of Jesus Christ is manifest in what the sermons say about God and the soul.

Under the heading of "The God-conception of Buddhism" the author of the sermons denies that Buddhism is either atheistic or pantheistic. The word that best represents the Buddhist God-idea is Dharmakaya. Dharmakaya is not personal. He is suchness; that which really exists; the sameness in all difference; the universal reason; the moral law; emptiness; voidness of particulars; faultlessness. Hence Dharmakaya is in everything. It (not "he," for the personal pronoun is definitely repudiated by the author) is the sum of all things, yet if all things perished it would still remain. In spite of the fact that the author declares against speculation as a source of religious truth, it is not surprising that in this connection he says that "Buddhism is the most speculative of all the existing religions," and on the basis of all that he writes it is difficult to escape the conviction that the Buddhist God is nothing other than a bald metaphysical principle.

The sermon on "Immortality" was delivered at Washington, D. C., and defines the soul as "the unity of consciousness which is liable at any moment to dissolve, and which comes to exist when there is a certain coördination of all mental faculties." On the basis of this definition immortality is of course denied and even sometimes ridiculed. The only immortality for us is the effects of the work we do and the influence we leave behind us. Transmigration, in the ordinary sense, is denied to be a doctrine of Buddhism, and yet one is puzzled by the fact that there are passages in the sermons that distinctly imply both immortality and transmigration.

In Buddhist ethics not the love of money but ignorance is "the root of all evil." In the degree in which men become "enlightened" they become pure and virtuous. Thus the universal reason manifests itself in its full glory and works its own destiny. There are ten deeds of goodness, six virtues of perfection and an eight-

fold path, which indicate particular virtues to be cultivated. The virtues named bear considerable resemblance to the ethical teachings of the Old Testament.

The author of the sermons belongs to the Zen, or Contemplation, sect, and hence he naturally devotes one sermon to this subject. It is one of the most interesting sermons in the book, and contains many suggestions that could with profit be taken up into practical religious life elsewhere than in the East. Contemplation signifies calm, patient, "introspection and self-examination," which leads to self-possession and strength. Several years ago the writer of this notice visited the monastery over which Mr. Shaku presides and was shown around by a young man of wealthy family who had graduated from the Imperial University and who, preparatory to becoming an army officer, was taking several years in the monastery to practice contemplation. The Zen sect of Buddhism has many adherents among military men in Japan. It gives them coolness and self-possession.

The Buddhism that appears in these sermons is of course the esoteric Buddhism. Popular Buddhism is very different. Nor is it the Buddhism of strongest sects, nor is it the Buddhism of Buddha himself. Also one cannot overcome the impression that in many instances the author strains a point to make Buddhism appear as squaring with modern science. The book is courteously polemic, but the courtesy is not quite uniform.

In addition to the sermons the book contains "The Sutra of Forty-two Chapters," the first Buddhist literature that was brought into China, several soldiers' memorial addresses, and a reply to an estimate of Buddhism by Dr. Barrows. D. B. SCHNEDER.

LIFE ON THE UPLANDS: An Interpretation of the twenty-third Psalm. By John D. Freeman, A. C. Armstrong and Sons, New York.

One opens this little volume of 139 pages with great expectations after reading on its cover words of praise like this: "A wonderful, inspiring book by a brilliant Canadian author." It is hard to lay the book aside until it is finished, because this most familiar of all Psalms is so uniquely treated and one is disposed to agree with the finest things said about it. The little book is more than a commentary: it is a real "interpretation," fresh with feeling, keen with insight, rich in thought and pertinent quotation—a work of art, moreover, which makes one feel that it will live for a long time.

Most commentators, like Maclaren and Perowne, break the unity of the Psalm by treating it under the heads, the Good Shepherd and the Good Host. The Shepherd as such is the Host here and the unity is kept. The key to the author's treatment is found in what he calls its Time-Notes. He explains himself thus:

"A remarkable feature of this Psalm, but one which seems to

have been almost entirely overlooked hitherto, is the Time-Notes which are scattered through it. A careful study of its structure has convinced me that these notes occur at regular intervals throughout the Psalm, that they correspond to the successive periods of the shepherd's day, and that they reflect the whole round of the shepherd's work from the morning to the evening hours.

"Studied from this standpoint the Psalm, beginning with the second verse, presents a series of dissolving views which shade into one another with striking effect. By following these Time-Notes it not only becomes apparent that the figure of shepherdhood is carried through the composition consistently to the end, but the reader comes to appreciate the progress of its doctrine and the growing force and beauty of the teaching up to the last triumphant word."

This page on Time-Notes follows the first chapter, entitled "A Life in a Love," on the opening verse of the Psalm. The author's plan of treatment appears clearly from the titles of the succeeding chapters: "A Morning Meal on the Meadows," "A Mid-day Drink from the Well," "A Noontide Rest in the Shade," "An Afternoon Climb on the Paths," "Adventures in the Shadowed Glen," "Supper on the Darkening Wold," "Twilight at the Sheepfold Door," "Night Within the Gates," "Foregleams of the Heavenly Dawn."

After studying this Psalm in the light of these time-notes on the shepherd's day, which is to represent, of course, "life's little day" for man on earth, it is almost impossible to view it in any other light. Yet the adherence to this scheme is so close throughout that one feels some clauses are not drained of their richness in meaning. "My cup runneth over," for example, contributes far less than one feels it should. However, the excellences are so great that one forebears to attempt criticism.

The chapter on "An Afternoon Climb on the Paths,"—"he leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for his name's sake," is exceedingly fine.

Here's a sample paragraph:

"We all, like sheep, do go astray unless a divine pathfinder directs our steps. No more mischievous hallucination can beset a human soul than that of a fancied self-sufficiency for finding the true line of march. But men will ask, 'Is not conscience an infallible guide?' Conscience, indeed, holds high office in the human soul, but conscience is not pathfinder for us. Conscience is the faculty of moral discrimination, not of moral discovery. Conscience approves or disapproves of paths which are pointed out to us, but conscience finds no path of itself. Conscience is the commanding officer abiding in the tent and deciding upon the

movements of the army according to reports which the scouts bring in. Or we may say, conscience is a judge adjudicating between acts, motives, tendencies, when these are submitted for trial before its court. But it can only handle the case in view of the evidence presented before it. If the evidence is false or defective, the verdict is correspondingly corrupted. Hence it comes to pass that many of the blackest crimes which have stained the annals of the world have been done in the name and under the approval of conscience. Conscience commands, but conscience cannot guide."

HENRY H. RANCK.

THE PRAISE OF HYPOCRISY: An Essay in Casuistry. By G. T. Knight, D.D., Professor of Christian Theology in the Crane Theological School; with a preface by Professor D. L. Maulsby. The Open Court Publishing Co., Chicago, 1906.

This small volume of 85 pages is a reprint, with additions, from "The Open Court" of September, 1903. The matter in the book is divided into three heads: (1) The Hypocrisy of the Good; (2) The Good of Hypocrisy, and (3) The Cultivation of Hypocrisy.

But for the preface and a brief appendix by the author himself one would conclude that the book was written by an enemy of the church. The author quotes, without question or dissent, the testimony of men, both within and without the church, to substantiate what seems to him the almost universal prevalence of hypocrisy in their adherence to creeds, as well as their professions and practices, on the part of the various denominations of our day, and especially on that of the ministers of the church. Professor Maulsby tells us that Dr. Knight is a satirist and a reformer, and that "there can be no question as to the essential seriousness of the book before us." The satire and the serious intention may be conceded, but if the author hopes to reform the church by satire such hope is likely to be deferred until it makes the heart sick.

The testimony of the witnesses on which the body of this little book is based is either true or it is not true. If it is true, the condition of things is too sad for satire; if it is not true, the venerable author should make use of his own recipe as given in the appendix: "The remedy for lying is not to keep on lying, but to stop lying." The prescription is rather negative and colorless in this form, but the writer is pleased with the author's own corrective when he adds: "Religion ought always to lay emphasis on sincerity. . . . Love for truth ought to be prominent and unmistakable." Yes, it is the positive, and not the negative, that constitutes the sovereign remedy for the ills of mankind. Light alone drives away darkness, and truth alone banishes errors. Nor ought it to be forgotten that the Spirit of the Master begets the manner of the Master in dealing with the evils of the church.

JOHN G. NOSS.

QUIET TALKS ABOUT JESUS. By S. D. Gordon, author of "Quiet Talks on Prayer" and "Quiet Talks on Power." A. C. Armstrong and Son, 1906. 12mo. Cloth. Pages 288. Net, 75 cents.

Mr. Gordon's writings have won great appreciation, and it is probable that this latest book will be accepted, as his publishers suggest, as embodying the utmost of his genius, the very keynote of his teaching. *Quiet Talks About Jesus* is a sincere attempt to "group up in simplest Anglo-Saxon English the statements of the entire Bible regarding Jesus." The topical arrangement is followed in four series, each complete in itself: I. "The Purpose of Jesus," which discusses the Divine purpose in the incarnation, the plan by which God meant to achieve His purpose, the tragic break in this plan, and the surprises, which work out of that break. II. "The Person of Jesus," as human, as Divine, as supremely winsome. III. "The Great Experiences of Jesus' Life," the baptism, the temptation, the transfiguration, the Gethsemane struggle, the Victory of Calvary, the Resurrection and the Ascension. IV. "Study Notes," which make it possible to follow Mr. Gordon's essential methods. The author declares emphatically: "I have no theory about Jesus to make these talks fit into. I have tried to find out for myself what the Old Book of God tells about Him. It was by the tedious path of twisting doubt that I climbed the hill of truth to the summit of certainty. I am free to confess that I am ignorant of the subject treated here save for the statements of that Book and for the assent within my own spirit to these statements, which has greatly deepened the impressions they made and make. There is no question here about that Book, but simply a taking and grouping together of what it says. A great musician strikes the keynote of a piece of music and keeps it sounding clear to the end. If what has come to me has gotten out of me into these pages, there will be found a dominant note of sweetest music, the winsomeness of God in Jesus."

Undoubtedly the most original thing about this volume is its style. Crisp, clear, vigorous and homely are these epigrammatic sentences. Mr. Gordon "talks home to the heart." He has an effective way of stating the old truths, which makes an insistent appeal. But back of this unique style we can feel the throbbing of a warm heart and recognize a remarkable keenness of spiritual vision. Whatever mistakes of literalism it may contain, even if the critic may discover an occasional *non sequitur*, this book is clearly the work of a man who loves Jesus, and must, therefore, have value for all others who love Him. Its pages bear testimony to habitual broad reading on the part of the author, and surrender of will and life to God's mastery as the spirit-key to an understanding of His word. We can be

thankful for such an account of our Master's life. If you read it with reverent spirit, it will afford you a life-giving look into the sweet, strong, patient face of Jesus.

PAUL S. LEINBACH.

THE HOPE OF IMMORTALITY: OUR REASONS FOR IT. By Charles Fletcher Dole. Thomas Y. Crowell and Co., 1906. Pages 61.

The Ingersoll Lectures on Immortality, delivered at Harvard University, usually render a valuable contribution to our religious literature by producing arguments of more or less value to demonstrate the rationality of belief in life beyond the grave. Martensen once declared that man does not believe in the immortality of the soul because he has ever conclusively proved it, but he is forever trying to prove it because he cannot help believing it. In this little volume by Dr. Dole we find the Ingersoll lecture for 1906, and we can sincerely recommend its perusal to every reader of the *REVIEW*. As a philosophical treatise, this is one of the clearest presentments of a vexed theme it has been our good fortune to see. It reaches to the vital conclusion that the hope of immortality is not a cheap thing, but costly. It is not an idea that can be had merely for the reading of books or the witnessing of a scientific demonstration; it depends upon and grows out of character. "It goes with the daily practice of immortality. Otherwise, it is only at best a matter of temperament, tradition and hearsay."

PAUL S. LEINBACH.

THE GATE OF DEATH—A DIARY. Attributed to A. C. Benson, author of "From a College Window" and the "Upton Letters." New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons.

This is a diary written during the time between June 15 and October 14 as the author was slowly gaining his strength after a severe accident and a subsequent illness of several months. Twice he came to the very gate of death and was perfectly conscious both times of the jeopardy in which his life lay; but on the day the diary opens a great physician told him that his complete recovery will be only a matter of time, and the thoughts and reminiscences of these days have been here recorded. The account of the writer's accident and illness is given with graphic simplicity which arouses the interest and sympathy of the reader at once. Neither does this interest wane as he goes on to discuss the great questions which he faced as he came back to health and strength. The immortality of the soul and its future state, the problem of evil, the meaning of the death of Christ and the standards of usefulness in our lives are taken up from day to day—not in a studied careful fashion but in the simple medita-

tive way in which the themes were worked out in his own mind. The author says somewhere that he thinks best with a pencil in his hand, and one feels that his thought develops as he writes, and that he puts his thoughts down honestly as they come to him. The delightful style of the diarist, his culture and learning, his freedom from morbidness, his love for people and his sympathy with nature make reading on any page of the volume a pleasure. Although one would wish to read the entries in their order, there is no one line of thought nor could the material be summarized. No review can give an adequate notion of the content of the book.

The diary is in the author's own words "nothing but the record of the sincere and faltering thoughts of one who was suddenly and unexpectedly confronted with death, and who, in the midst of a very ordinary and commonplace life, with no deep reserves of wisdom, faith or tenderness had just to interpret it as best he could." And again he says: "Such value as these pages do possess is due to the fact that the writer has tried as simply and sincerely as he can, to look his experiences steadily in the face, not to disguise his bewilderment, his suffering and his fear, and at the same time not to attempt to explain away in a faithless and despondent spirit, the hopes, the instincts, the consolations that went with him to the brink of the dark stream." The sincerity, the simplicity and the intimacy of his self-revelation make the book a very charming one. Its theology is neither positive nor convincing, but it is interesting as a sincere record of one man's thought in all those things which whether he will or no the intelligent man must sometime or other think about. His thought is often suggestive, stimulating and striking and from a psychological point of view this record of his mind and soul as he is confronted with death and then passes through a long period of convalescence must be most valuable.

To the ordinary mind and heart most appealing and helpful are those passages which deal with the commonplace everyday life we all have to live, where the ground is sure and the knowledge certain though perhaps hitherto we have neither recognized nor expressed what is here put down in convincing language. We linger over and give ready response to those simple portrayals of a good man's heart, and they lead us to see more clearly not so much what we may do to meet death more easily, but what after all is of most account in living. Of the hours when he thought himself dying he writes, "Small incidents, long forgotten or forgiven, I doubt not, by those who were dear to me, came back to me with a throb of sorrow. It may be that they were unimportant things enough, I do not know, I can only say that they seemed to me to have been the things which mattered.

What I bitterly regretted was that my absorption in my work and in myself had left me so little leisure to make the lives of others sweeter and happier." Motives conventional and inner, as he calls them; the loneliness of dying and "how little fit one is for loneliness"; the beauty of the Psalms which "seem not the voice of man but the voice of humanity"; the unreasonableness of the conventional mode of burial; the soothing and sympathetic power of nature; these and many other minor themes the author treats in the same delightful way.

There is in the latter half of this diary, especially, a saneness, a joy in living, a freshness of thought that belong peculiarly, we believe, to the happy convalescent. "I have learnt," says the writer, "that one perceives things by resting in a way in which one does not always perceive them by working. I have learnt that such hours as these fill up and replenish the fountains of the soul." There is a suggestion in these pages of the new sense of proportion with which Browning endows the risen Lazarus. "Everything that I see or do or hear seems to have a rich and sweet significance." For this alone the volume would be well worth reading for it places one with the writer at a new point of view, endowing him with clarified vision, a newly touched heart, and a quickened sense of the all-pervading love of God. It is this love of God upon which the author finally rests with many of his old doubts and doctrines discarded. "To-day," he says, "my faith, my religion has become a simpler, freer thing, not a hope mixed up with knowledge, a strange hybrid, compounded part of history, part of philosophy, part of moral effort. To-day it seems a kind of close kinship, nearness of spirit, an attitude. There seems a Person behind it all who sees, listens, approves, loves. . . . There are some parts of my faith which are richer and fuller than ever before, because through it there seems to flow something of that moving tide of love which bears us on its bosom as it sets to unknown shores. God, Christ, the Spirit, these are not doctrines to me any more, but vital presences, larger if less precise, dearer if more unknown."

H. S. HARTMAN.

PRACTICAL READER AND SPEAKER. By John Milton Chambers, A.M., Professor of Oratory and Rhetoric in Franklin and Marshall College, and the Theological Seminary. Boston, Mayhew Publishing Company. Pages 353.

This book, "edited" (as Professor Chambers modestly puts it) "for use in schools and colleges, and in the home," is divided into three parts. Part I., comprising ten chapters, treats of "Principles of Expression"; Part II., containing two chapters, deals with "Oratory"; Part III., in thirteen chapters, presents a great variety of selections, in prose and verse, culled from

English and American authors. These selections are grouped under the following heads: "Colloquial," "Narrative," "Pathetic," "Humorous," "Smooth," "Grave and Solemn," "Gay," "Oratorical," "Sublime and Reverential," "Dramatic," "Abrupt," "Patriotic," "Miscellaneous."

The editor has shown a catholic, unexcluding taste in his choice of illustrative authors. For him (to parody Charles Lamb) Milton is not too lofty nor Chauncey Depew too low. On his roster may be found the names of Shakspeare, Pope, Wordsworth, Coleridge, Shelley, Byron, Burns, Tennyson, Browning, Scott, Dickens, and Thackeray; of Longfellow, Whittier, Holmes, Lowell, Emerson, Poe, Lincoln, Curtis, Blaine, Ingersoll, Trowbridge, Hay, Burdette, Riley, and Van Dyke. And yet, catholic as he is in his choice of authors, he is discriminating in his choice of specimens. He has admitted only what is worthy and representative.

The collection, it will be observed, is particularly rich in examples of American literature. This has been made possible by the permission of authors and publishers to print from copyrighted books.

In his purpose to provide selections "for the exercise of every kind of emotion," Professor Chambers has succeeded admirably. Although the work is intended primarily for use as a text-book in schools and colleges, it will be found most useful to the individual student who is ambitious to improve himself in reading and expression. In households blessed with children it will be eagerly welcomed; in supplying readings for public entertainments it will be found invaluable.

C. ERNEST WAGNER.

MARCHING AGAINST THE IROQUOIS. By Everett T. Tomlinson. Boston and New York, Houghton, Mifflin and Company. Pages 388. Net \$1.50.

This story of the American Revolution, besides giving an interesting account of life in colonial times and some good character sketches, possesses considerable historical value in its description of General Sullivan's expedition into the Iroquois country and his punishment of the Six Nations. The trials of the settlers, the depredations of the Indians, the long and difficult march of Sullivan's forces northward from Pennsylvania and westward from Albany until they effected a junction and laid waste the villages, fields, and orchards of the Red Men, are set forth in glowing colors. The sketches of General Schuyler and the Indian Chief Brout are well done. And for those who like an exciting story, the adventures of Heber Otis and Susan Randall with the exploits of the inimitable Timothy Murphy will furnish entertaining reading.

J. S. STAHR.

REMINISCENCES OF BISHOPS AND ARCHBISHOPS. By Henry Codman Potter, Bishop of New York. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1906.

Both in form and contents this volume is delightful. The binding, paper and printing attract the reader. An excellent portrait precedes the account of each character. The author is prepared better, perhaps, than any one else in this country, to write on this subject. He has been connected with the House of Bishops of the Episcopal Church nearly forty years. He has learnt to know the prominent bishops in this country and even in England by personal and friendly contact. Many incidents which the historian and biographer would fail to note are here recorded. They are by no means insignificant but throw light on the qualities of the men, who have not only been Episcopalians or bishops, but Christians and Americans, and are, therefore, related to us all. In his book the author speaks in his easy, graceful manner as he would around the tea table or before the blazing hearth. How a single incident sheds light on the peculiar nature of men is illustrated by a remark of Bishop Brooks. He was naturally not attracted by the dull routine of the House of Bishops. He was privileged to attend only one General Convention, and then, of course, as a junior bishop who was expected to be seen rather than heard. He was evidently bored by the proceedings. "When I passed his seat," says Bishop Potter, "he plucked my sleeve, and drawing me down, whispered in my ear, Henry, is it always as dull as this?"

Reminiscences of ten of the American bishops and three archbishops of the English Church are presented. The biographies of most, if not all, of these men have been published. Their deeds are recorded in history but we venture to say that the author has thrown side-lights on these men which will illuminate the weightier writings. He has shown their lighter, more playful, and eccentric qualities which make them all the more human and beloved. In general histories the barest outlines of men are given; for coloring, life and individuality one must have recourse to books like these.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.

EXPOSITIONS OF HOLY SCRIPTURE. A Commentary on the Entire Bible to be Completed in Thirty Volumes. Alexander Maclaren, D.D., Lit.D. Sold only in Series of Six Volumes. \$7.50 net. Second Series, Six Volumes: Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers; Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges and Ruth; Samuel; St. Mark (2 vols.); Acts. A. C. Armstrong and Son, 3 and 5 W. 18th Street, New York, 1907.

We noticed the first series of these Expositions in the Review for October, 1906. Our favorable opinion then expressed has not been changed by an examination of the volumes of the second series. On the contrary the admiration for the author and his

ability as an expositor of the Bible increases as one reads these unique and unparalleled comments. He seems to be equally at home in the Old and the New Testaments. His knowledge is not that of a philologist, archæologist and critic. He uses the results of their researches, and shows wide reading and a liberal spirit. Yet he does not attempt to present a work for scholars nor can he be classed with the progressive or aggressive theologians. He has the keen insight of one who walks in the Spirit. He correlates the vision of the prophets and the message of the apostles with the needs, aspirations and problems of the present day. His knowledge of the Scripture is commensurate with his knowledge of the human heart. Knowing man, he is able to interpret with so much life, color and warmth the word of God. His ministry of fifty years was spent largely in the preparation of this material. Much of it was printed in periodicals and, after careful revision by the author, is now submitted in final form. However, a fair proportion of the contents is published for the first time.

One is impressed by the excellence of the expositions in all the volumes. The chapters are rarely disappointing. The style is clear, vivid, suggestive and attractive. He has an original way both of stating his topics and of treating them. The reader will at once find in many of the discussions suitable themes for sermons and talks for prayer meetings. Since Dr. Maclaren has for years written notes on the International Sunday School Lessons, these volumes are a valuable commentary for the Sunday School teacher. The lessons for the last and the present quarter, for example, are expounded in order. From the material so far published, we are safe in assuming that there will not be many lessons in the international course that are not explained in one or the other volume of the series.

We are pleased to find a special effort made by the Publication Board of the Reformed Church to sell this publication to the readers of the *Messenger*. We heartily commend the volumes, which have appeared, to the preachers, teachers and laymen of the Reformed Church, and trust the purchasers will take advantage of the liberal offer of the Publication Board.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.